



# Archetypes: Toward a Jungian Anthropology of Consciousness

---

CHARLES D. LAUGHLIN

Carleton University  
cdlaughlin@gmail.com

VINCENZA A. TIBERIA

American Clinical Psychologist  
drtiberia@hotmail.com

## ABSTRACT

*It is very curious that C.G. Jung has had so little influence upon the anthropology of consciousness. In this paper, the reasons for this oversight are given. The archetypal psychology of Jung is summarized and shown to be more complex and useful than extreme constructivist accounts would acknowledge. Jung's thinking about consciousness fits very well with a modern neuroscience view of the psyche and acts as a corrective to relativist notions of consciousness and its relation to the self.*

KEYWORDS: Jungian psychology, consciousness, neuroanthropology, archetypes, dreams

It has frequently been our experience when speaking to anthropological colleagues about archetypes, archetypal structures, or the collective unconscious—all pivotal notions in Carl G. Jung's (1875–1961) depth psychology—that they usually seem to have a very vague idea of what we are talking about, if any. There often seems to be a phenomenological gap between talking about archetypes as a concept and realizing them in direct experience—for instance, recognizing archetypal elements in one's own dreaming life world. Compounding the problem, our colleagues are usually unaware of the technical aspects of Jung's thinking and application of the “archetype” concept to psychological issues like dreaming, visions, fantasies, mythic symbolism, and

so forth. This is somewhat ironic (and frankly not a little embarrassing) considering the fact that Jung, like Freud before him, was totally engrossed in the ethnology of his day and grounded many of his discussions on ethnographic findings (see e.g. Hunt-Meeks 1983). As the concept of the archetype is fundamental to symbolic anthropology (the anthropological study of meaning and interpretation), psychological anthropology (the anthropological study of the influences of culture upon the development of the individual), the anthropology of religion (the anthropological study of a people's worldview, spiritual life, rituals, and myths), and neuroanthropology (the anthropological study of the human nervous system and how it facilitates learning, adaptation, and social relations), we feel it might be useful to explore the notion of archetype in Jung's thinking in detail and then show how the concept might be applied to issues of anthropological interest.<sup>1</sup>



#### IMPEDIMENTS TO A JUNGIAN ANTHROPOLOGY

One of the real puzzles over the years has been the paucity of Jungian influence in the anthropology of consciousness. While it is safe to say that Freud has had a profound effect upon psychological anthropology, Jung has had very little. Jung's theory of consciousness is routinely either ignored or oversimplified and distorted by psychological anthropologists (e.g. Mageo 2003). The reasons why anthropologists have ignored Jungian archetypal psychology are very revealing of the biases floating around in the discipline.

There are at least three reasons we can see for why anthropologists ignore Jung's work. In the first place, Jung cannot just be read, *he must be studied*—and by study we mean immersion in his entire oeuvre, for his ideas were never fixed into a seamless system but rather evolved over the half-century of his writings. Jung cannot be understood by merely googling Wikipedia and reading a page or two. Getting to understand Jungian thought requires a major commitment in time and effort—even more so than, say, the works of Levi-Strauss—but the time and energy are well spent, for there lies a treasure trove of insight in his many works.

In the second place, Jung's approach to consciousness was fundamentally phenomenological (especially his later works), as we shall see when we get to his approach to archetypes and dreaming. In the last analysis, one cannot understand Jung—especially the later Jung—unless one has walked at least part way in his experiential shoes. Jungian methods require realization of concepts in experience. It is the difference between knowing that a 20-minute walk a day will better your health and actually doing the walking and experiencing the benefits. Jung was both a scholar and an advanced, disciplined, and tenacious phenomenologist. He combined scholarship and

meditation beautifully, and to follow his psychology one must spend at least some effort in the direction of realization—or, to use Husserlian terms, to actually attain a *Jungian epoché*.

In the third place, Jung's psychology is a type of structuralism—the notion that behind observables in language, text, symbolism, culture, and social action lie nonobservable structures that produce the observables. From its very inception, anthropology has exhibited strains of structuralist thought, beginning with Adolph Bastian (1826–1905), arguably the father of ethnology (Koepping 1983, 2007; Laughlin 2011:Chap. 3), and continuing through 19th century evolutionism and the “psychic unity of mankind” theorists, Durkheimian social anthropology, Jacobsonian structuralist linguistics, Piagetian genetic epistemology, Levi-Straussian structuralism, and, most recently, Laughlin and d'Aquili's *biogenetic structuralism* (e.g. Laughlin and d'Aquili 1974; Throop and Laughlin 2007). Structuralism holds that underlying the apparent variety of psychological or cultural forms may be found essential structures that, when understood, explain “surface” variations. For instance, Bastian held that the proper object of research is the “collective mind” of a people as iterated in the experience, thought, and actions of individuals. In other words, while the ethnographer records the “folk ideas” (*Volkergedanken*) of a particular society, he is really after the “elementary ideas” (*Elementargedanken*)—the structures from which the “folk ideas” are generated. From this perspective, the social group has a kind of group mind, a social “soul” (*Gesellschaftsseele*), if you will, in which the individual mind is embedded and influenced. Bastian believed that the elementary ideas are to be scientifically extracted from folk ideas (such as the belief that ancestors may visit one during a dream and communicate important information) as varying forms of collective representations (*Gesellschaftsgedanken*). An example of a collective representation might be the facility of the human brain to animate the image of a dead relative during dreaming, thus making it possible to interact with the “ancestor” in a very life-like way. Because one cannot observe the collective representations per se, Bastian (Koepping 1983) felt that the ethnographic project had to proceed through an analytical process by which one deduces the elementary ideas (e.g. ability of the brain to store and animate images of long-dead relatives) from the data on folk ideas (e.g. belief in ancestor visitations while dreaming).<sup>2</sup>

The history of anthropology during most of the 20th century has seen a resistance and rejection of structuralist (or “essentialist”) notions. The preferred account of human social and cultural life has been that of “cultural relativism,” originating in Franz Boas' antiracism and anti-evolutionist project during the early 20th century and the poststructuralist “social constructivism” of Bruno Latour and others. Meanwhile, the neurosciences have come of age and have flourished, thus presenting anthropology with a burgeoning

problem. If the human brain is the organ of learning, knowledge, imagination, feeling, action, and all else cultural, for the constructivist account to be true, the brain must begin life as a blank slate upon which a society programs its individual and distinct culture. But the brain is never at any point in its development a blank slate (Pinker 1997, 2003). Far from it in fact, as the brain is exquisitely organized since its initial formation *in utero*. Neural development, far from being passive social programming or “construction,” is a very active process of inherited neural models adapting to social and physical environmental press. Realization of this challenge to the received “constructivist” views of many anthropologists has been slow to form in our discipline. The resistance has been and continues to be intense. Yet the ethnologically relevant work of Carl Jung does provide an alternative groundwork for those who have the wit to see this challenge as an opportunity to elevate anthropology into the full-blown, “normal” science Bastian anticipated it would one day become.



#### JUNG'S PSYCHOLOGY

For those readers unfamiliar with Jung's approach to consciousness, let us take just a moment to summarize his views, but from a more modern neuropsychological standpoint. For Jung, the foundations of the psyche are the innumerable archetypes we inherit by virtue of being human. These archetypes are the same for every person on the planet, regardless of culture. In modern parlance, the archetypes are neural circuits that are genetically organized during the neurogenesis of the young brain. The sum total of the inherited archetypes in everyone's brain constitutes one's *collective unconscious*, structures that mediate all we psychologically share as members of the human species (Jung 1968c). Depending upon adaptation to the physical and social environment, some archetypes develop while others languish in a relatively undeveloped state. When archetypes (neural circuits) develop into more elaborated structures (or networks), they are called *complexes*. Experience with the archetypes will lead to the coalescence or “agglomeration” of associations related to the archetype. Thoughts, memories, emotions, imagery, and reactions may all become clustered about the developing archetype. Hence, the roles of the physical and sociocultural environment are primary in the development of complexes, and thus the entire psyche (the sum total of all archetypes and complexes, whether conscious or unconscious) as a whole is the product of both genetic inheritance and enculturation.

Consciousness for Jung is fully embodied. One complex among many becomes the presiding structure we call the ego, or the “ego-complex”

(i.e. the “I”). One function of consciousness is to maintain the relationship between the ego and the unconscious (1970 [1955/56]:371n). The development of the ego and consciousness unfold hand in hand. Metaphorically speaking, “the conscious rises out of the unconscious like an island newly risen from the sea” (1954:52). The psyche is full of structures that mediate aspects of perception, cognition, imagination, emotion, and action that may or may not be conscious to the ego—some in fact never are. Above all, consciousness for Jung is not a thing, not an entity. Jung saw consciousness, in a very Jamesian way, as a dynamic flow of experienced moments in which first this and then that archetype or complex entered ego awareness. Consciousness arises with the ego at its center.<sup>3</sup>



#### THE ARCHETYPES

Jungian psychology is a vast subject. It is simply impossible for us to explore the entirety of Jungian psychology, its foundations in psychotherapy, its concern with alleviating the suffering caused by various psychopathologies, its philosophical roots and implications, or its place in the history of the psychoanalytical school of psychology. Rather, we are interested in just one primary ingredient in Jung’s view of how the human psyche works—the archetypes—for this element has profound implications for doing ethnology. It is the psychology of the archetypes that makes Jung’s perspective a structuralist approach.

Let us explore in more detail what it means to refer to “archetypes” and “archetypal structures.” Our take on archetypes comes mainly from Jung’s own prolific writings on the subject, for it was he who developed the most complete account of the notion.<sup>4</sup> As some readers will know, Carl Jung was struck by the importance of universal patterns in the ideation of his patients, in myth and literature, and especially in his own dreams and fantasies (Stevens 1982; see also Van de Castle 1994:Chap. 7; Haule 2010). He first came to the idea of dream symbolism as reflections of primordial material in the unconscious during a trip he took with Freud in 1909 (1965 [1961]:158–161), and he parted company with Freud largely because of his teacher’s inability to drop his positivist/materialist conditioning when dealing with material from the unconscious (1970 [1955/56]:473; Dourley 1984:38; Hobson 1988 *passim*) and to transcend his involvement with the subjective aspects of dreams and other symbolic products of unconscious processes (1956 [1912]:xxiii–xxvi). For Jung, dream symbolism was transparently meaningful and, with respect to dreaming, does not require a false Freudian distinction between manifest and latent content.<sup>5</sup>

Jung argued that human and animal experience is produced by the development of instinctive structures that are archaic, transpersonal, and even transcultural (1956 [1912]:3–6; see also Edinger 1972; Neumann 1969:270). He borrowed his earliest term for these structures, “*imago*,” from Freud, and changed its meaning from that of a constellation of images, ideas, and emotions formed in early childhood to that of an independent constellation of primordial material inherited from the distant evolutionary past (1956 [1912]:44n). He later termed these structures *archetypes* (1968a:43) and the total collection of these structures the psyche’s *collective unconscious* (1968b:3–4):

*[The] personal unconscious rests upon a deeper layer, which does not derive from personal experience and is not a personal acquisition but is inborn. This deeper layer I call the collective unconscious. I have chosen the term “collective” because this part of the unconscious is not individual but universal; in contrast to the personal psyche, it has contents and modes of behavior that are more or less the same everywhere and in all individuals. It is, in other words, identical in all men and thus constitutes a common psychic substrate of a suprapersonal nature which is present in every one of us.*

Jung’s conception of the archetypes underwent alteration over the course of the half century between the time of his trip with Freud in 1909 and his death in 1961. It is thus a mistake to take his definition of the archetypes from any one era as definitive. Rather, it is far more illuminating to track the development of his ideas as his own psychological and spiritual understanding unfolded, primarily through his phenomenological exploration of his own dreams and visions. Yet certain attributes remained fairly consistent throughout his writings. For Jung, the archetypes are the result of the evolution of the structure of the human psyche. Over and over again Jung emphasized that the archetypes are part of human inheritance—right up there with livers and lungs. They are extraordinarily stable and enduring structures (Jung 1970 [1955/56]:463) that form the fundamental organization of the psyche, that arise anew in every human incarnation, and that are akin to the instincts.

The archetypes themselves undoubtedly have changed during our evolutionary past—there is really no way to know for sure (1953 [1943/45]:368)—but in their present form they encode the recurrent structures that mediate the typical experiences of human beings over hundreds of millennia and across all cultural boundaries (1970 [1955/56]:390; Stevens 1982:17; Krippner, Bogzaran, and Percia de Carvalho 2002:149). In some instances, they encode recurrent experiential material from our pre-hominin primate

past (1953 [1943/45]:96). Archetypal structures underlie all recurrent, “typical” (pan-humanly typical, not culturally or personally typical) ideas, images, categories, situations, and events that arise in experience (Stevens 1982:23; Hillman 1985:12). They contain no inherent content but exist “at first only as forms without content, representing merely the possibility of a certain type of perception and action” (1968b:48). Archetypes may manifest as “a priori, inborn forms of ‘intuition’” (Jung 1969d [1919]:133). As the instincts impel us to act in a distinctly human way, so do the archetypes impel us to perceive and understand the events to which we instinctively respond in a distinctly human way (1970 [1955/56]:87). For Jung, instinct and archetype were two sides of the same unconscious functional coin (1969d [1919]:136–137):

*Just as we have been compelled to postulate the concept of an instinct determining or regulating our conscious actions, so, in order to account for the uniformity and regularity of our perceptions, we must have recourse to the correlated concept of a factor determining the mode of apprehension. It is this factor which I call the archetype or primordial image. The primordial image might suitably be described as the instinct’s perception of itself, or as the self-portrait of the instinct, in exactly the same way as consciousness is an inward perception of the objective life-process. Just as conscious apprehension gives our actions form and direction, so unconscious apprehension through the archetype determines the form and direction of instinct.*

Thus the archetypes may be characterized as being instinctual, a priori “meaning” and the collective unconscious as containing both the instincts and the archetypes (1969d [1919]:133–134).

The ubiquitous activity of the archetypes in the functioning of the psyche is an important factor in understanding Jung’s conception of the evolution of consciousness and the unconscious, for most discussions of the archetypes, including his own at times, tend to emphasize a handful of relatively “big,” dramatic forms; e.g. the Wise Old Man, the Great Mother, “internal” marriage, anima and animus, the Mandala, the Divine Child, the Hero, the Kore or Divine Maiden, the Trickster (humorous figures like Mullah Nasruddin in Sufi stories or Coyote in Navajo stories), and sundry spiritual journeys and initiations, and so forth. These few forms are those that are particularly salient in important dreams and myths, whereas most archetypes mediate the “little,” very mundane functioning of perception, cognition, and activity in everyday psychological life. “Little” archetypes, such as the object, the face, the hand, water, air, and so forth, may rise to the level of “big”

archetype if used metaphorically in myth (e.g. the air element, the face of God) or practice (e.g. baptism in flowing water).



#### ARCHETYPAL TRANSFORMATIONS

Jung emphasized that we cannot apprehend the archetypes directly. All that we can know are the manifest archetypal images and ideas that are mediated by the archetypes and that arise in the symbolism of our own experience or that we deduce from the ideas and images found in texts and other symbolic forms (1968b:56–57, 1969a [1946]:213). Moreover, the archetypes are not material that was once conscious and somehow got lost either in early childhood or in some archaic hominin age. Rather, the archetypes have never been conscious during the course of either ontogenesis or phylogenesis (1968b:42, 1969a [1946]:210). Unconscious archetypal structures underlie and generate the symbolism that is so fundamental to all mythological and cosmological systems and are responsible for the patterned similarities among these systems (1969a [1946]:206, Edinger 1972:4, Laughlin and Throop 2001). The archetypes produce such distinctive and universal motifs as the incest taboo, the unity of opposites, the King, the Goddess, the Hero, shape-shifting spirits, and so on. It is clear in Jung's treatment that actual engagement with the archetypes is a dynamic and developmental process, involving both the assimilation of archetypal contents into consciousness and, as a consequence, the transformation and development of the archetypes themselves (1968b:5).

Jung's experience taught him that the attributes of the archetypes are known through reflection upon their various *transformations*—upon their manifestations in dreams, fantasies, projections, myths, art, and so forth—a methodology not unfamiliar to students of other schools that attempt to define structure, such as those of Claude Levi-Strauss and Jean Piaget. For example, as Jung pointed out, “We must, however, constantly bear in mind that what we mean by ‘archetype’ is in itself irrepresentable, but has effects which make visualizations of it possible, namely, the archetypal images and ideas” (1969a [1946]:214), and again, “Man knows no more than his consciousness, and he knows himself only so far as this extends. Beyond that lies the unconscious sphere with no assignable limits, and it too belongs to the phenomenon Man” (1970 [1955/56]:368), and yet again, “The archetype as such is a psychoid [deep structural] factor that belongs, as it were, to the invisible, ultraviolet end of the psychic spectrum. It does not appear, in itself, to be capable of reaching consciousness. I venture this hypothesis because everything archetypal which is perceived by consciousness seems to represent a set of variations on a ground theme” (1968a:218; 1969a [1946]:213; see also



1969a [1946]:231). In addition, we never come to the end—either of the transformations of which any archetype is capable or of our knowledge or explication of any archetype (1968b:160).

An archetype may manifest in dreams, visions, fantasies, and other ASC, and may shift its eidetic form within the experience of the individual, among individuals in a group, and across cultures. A lovely example was used by Krippner, Bogzaran, and Percia de Carvalho (2002:150) involving the archetype of “internal” marriage. According to Jung, to reach spiritual maturity in the self, the male and female parts of the self must unite into a single conscious melding of opposites. But when the marriage archetype arises in dreams cross-culturally, how it is represented is influenced by the type of marriage customarily practiced in each culture, whether that be monogamy, polygamy, polyandry, or even group marriage. Marriage patterns range enormously among the societies of the world, and most of these are quite alien to Western ways of organization (see Parkin and Stone 2004). So, too, will archetypes express themselves via local imagery. We would expect that dreaming of the water archetype for a Kalihari Bushman would be different in form than dreaming of water among people living on a South Pacific atoll.

Why is this distinction between the archetypes and their personal, collective, and cross-cultural manifestations so important that it needs to be emphasized? For the very simple reasons that some authorities: (1) do not understand this distinction; (2) conflate archetypal structure with archetypal symbol; and (3) equate the variety of manifest content mediated by archetypes with the nonexistence of universal archetypes. A good example is the extent to which Kelly Bulkeley (1994:Ch. 15) acknowledged the depth psychology of profound spiritual symbolism in dreams, while in the same breath rejecting the universality implied in the notion of archetype. Bulkeley called these symbols “root metaphors”: “Dreams do have a dimension of religious meaning; this dimension emerges out of the root metaphors in dreams. To understand fully the root metaphors of dreams requires an interdisciplinary integration of the different fields of dream study with a theory of interpretation and a theory of religious metaphor” (1994:134). Notice that while calling for an interdisciplinary approach, he nowhere added the biological or neuroscientific fields to the team. Reading between the lines in his description of Jung’s approach to dreams (1994:Ch. 5), we suspect he neither grounds his thinking in embodied processes nor does he understand the crucial distinction between structure and transformation—a failing of many students who have mangled the two when struggling with the works of structuralists like Jung, Piaget, and Levi-Strauss.

It is critical to understand that Jung’s whole approach was *essentially phenomenological* (Dourley 1984:39; Brooke 1999). The archetypes are not

merely theoretical deductive concepts but are derivable from introspection of patterns in one's own direct experience (1968b:56). We know the archetypes, not by merely thinking and theorizing about them but by experiencing their myriad transformations in the arena of our own dreams and other ASC and then reflecting upon on the patterns in those experiences (1968b:30). Indeed, there is no other way of coming to know the archetypes in any personally meaningful way.

What makes the activity of the archetypes distinctive in human affairs is the sense of profundity and numinosity that commonly accompanies their emergence into consciousness (1969a [1946]:205, 1970 [1955/56]:390, 524). Their numinosity is derived from the fact that they store up and are conduits for affective and libidinous energies from lower levels of the psyche (1956 [1912]:232)—from the “core consciousness” as described by Damasio (2010). Archetypal eruptions may be so numinous and transpersonal that the experience of them may lead to fascination, conversion, and faith (1956 [1912]:232), and even to states of possession and overidentification with the imagery (1968a:36, 1968b:39, Edinger 1972:7). At the very least, such experiences are affectively gripping and tend to dominate one's attention for a time until an interpretation of them is assimilated into the conscious ego. Anthropologists have encountered this numinosity cross-culturally and make a distinction between archetypal, titanic, or “culture pattern” dreams and everyday, “normal” dreams (see Hunt 1989:128).



#### DEVELOPMENT OF ARCHETYPES

The archetypes are not solely an adult phenomenon. They are present from the beginning of life and, indeed, are the only foundation of childhood psychic development (1954:52, 1968b:160). Another way to say this is that the ego—“the complex factor to which all conscious contents are related” (1959 [1951]:3)—is the result of the archetypes coming to know themselves. As an archetype grows and develops, it establishes neurocognitive associations and eventually takes on the role of a *complex*—a complex being an archetype plus all of its developmentally associated emotions, images, thoughts, desires, reactions, projections, and perceptions stored in memory. These complexes become very autonomous and actively seek out neural associations but are rarely associated directly with the ego—the ego being the regnant complex of waking life. It is the encounter with unconscious, autonomous complexes during dreams that are, for Jung (Young 1994), the origins of the idea of spirits.

This is the *uroboros* motif that Erich Neumann (1969:10) placed at the center of the evolution and development of consciousness; the self-devouring archetypal ground of all experience. Although his views about child consciousness may be considered quaint by some readers in light of experimental findings in modern developmental psychology, Jung was aware that a child's experience is thoroughly archetypal: "The child's psyche, prior to the stage of ego-consciousness, is very far from being empty and devoid of content. Scarcely has speech developed when, in next to no time, consciousness is present; and this, with its momentary contents and its memories, exercises an intensive check upon the previous collective contents" (1954:44).

Although he rarely concerned himself with the consciousness of children, Jung clearly had a developmental framework in mind when discussing the nature of the archetypes and their growth into complexes—especially in his earlier formulations (see 1969b [1931]). It is the unfolding collective unconscious and its nascent archetypal structures that produce the highly mythological contents of children's dreams (1954:45). Eventually this unfolding landscape of archetypal material participates in a developmental dialogue with the emerging conscious ego that becomes the *sine qua non* of the process of *individuation* (i.e. the life-long development and integration of the psyche; 1953 [1943/45]:172–173, Edinger 1972, Dourley 1984). "In this way the conscious rises out of the unconscious like an island newly risen from the sea" (1954:52).

Neumann (1969) picked up on this developmental thread in Jung's thinking (1953 [1943/45]) and, with the latter's full approval (see 1969c), constructed a thoroughly developmental account of the archetypal imagery in mythology. On the assumption that ontology recapitulates phylogeny, Neumann (1969:xvi)—in a somewhat Piagetian manner—examined the stages of development of consciousness as reflected in the world's various mythological systems for clues as to the stages in the evolution of consciousness. Neumann, like Jung before him, treated archetypes as at least analogous to physical organs (1968b:160–161, Neumann 1969:xvi) and spoke of them as such—which is not at all far fetched if one considers archetypal structures as neural circuitry. The archetype is as much an organ to the psyche as the liver is to metabolism. As organs, archetypes develop during the course of life.

Edward Edinger (1985:98–99) borrowed the alchemical term "coagulation" for the process by which archetypes become activated in childhood and subsequently distorted and limited in their functions due to the assimilation of their structure (or circuitry) by the developing ego. The archetypes express themselves in emerging consciousness as images and ideas, and these transformations are actively assimilated into the conscious ego in such a way as to produce negative feedback that constrains further transformations. The process by which the ego assimilates essentially transpersonal, pan-human

material gradually lessens the mysterious and numinous qualities of pure archetypal eruptions.

Indeed, the process of assimilation may become so active that the ego overidentifies with and feels responsible for producing archetypal materials. Those of us who have spent time in spiritual disciplines may recognize the common phenomenon of individuals who over identify with and personalize essentially transpersonal experiences (see Neumann [1954:336–337] on “secondary personalization” and Edinger [1972:7–16] on “inflation” of the ego). For Jung, this overidentification of ego with transpersonal experience may also account for certain dynamic aspects of psychosis.



#### ONTOLOGY OF ARCHETYPES

As noted above, Jung appeared to be undecided in his own mind about the ontological status of the archetypes (see e.g. 1968b:58; see also Dourley 1993). This state of affairs has led to considerable confusion and controversy over the decades. But we believe that Jung’s ambiguity was necessitated by the state of the neurosciences of his day. He could not scientifically reconcile his conviction that the archetypes are simultaneously embodied structures and that they bear the imprint of the sublime. He was convinced by his own experience that the archetypes are both neural structures and represent the domain of spirit. Jung’s intention was clearly a unitary one, and yet his ontology seemed often to drift into dualism and ambiguity and was necessarily so because the neuropsychology of his day could not envision a nondualistic conception of spirit and matter. Nonetheless, he did posit the existence of dream-producing strata in the nervous system and suggested a role for the sympathetic nervous system in the mediation of dreaming. He did this in an eerily prescient way, considering the psychophysiological research that began not long after he raised the issue (1969a[1952]:510–511):<sup>6</sup>

*Thus we are driven to the conclusion that a nervous substrate like the sympathetic system, which is absolutely different from the cerebrospinal system in point of origin and function, can evidently produce thoughts and perceptions just as easily as the latter. ...one must ask whether the normal state of unconsciousness in sleep, and the potentially conscious dreams it contains, can be regarded in the same light—whether, in other words, dreams are produced not so much by the activity of the sleeping cortex, as by the unsleeping sympathetic system, and are therefore of a transcerebral nature.*

Jung's dualism is further apparent in his distinction between the archetypes and the instincts that required a polarization of the psyche into those products derived from matter and those derived from spirit. He imagined the psyche as the intersection at the apex of two cones—one of spirit and the other of matter (1969a [1946]:215). One passage is worth quoting at length because it signifies—by his use of the metaphor of the light spectrum—the essential ontological dualism with which he was encumbered:

*Just as the “psychic infra-red,” the biological instinctual psyche, gradually passes over into the physiology of the organism and thus merges with its chemical and physical conditions, so the “psychic ultra-violet,” the archetypes, describes a field which exhibits none of the peculiarities of the physiological and yet, in the last analysis, can no longer be regarded as psychic, although it manifests itself psychically. But physiological processes behave in the same way, without on that account being declared psychic. Although there is no form of existence that is not mediated to us psychically and only psychically, it would hardly do to say that everything is merely psychic. We must apply this argument logically to the archetypes as well. Since their essential being is unconscious to us, and still they are experienced as spontaneous agencies, there is probably no alternative now but to describe their nature, in accordance with their chiefest effect, as “spirit,” .... If so, the position of the archetype would be located beyond the psychic sphere, analogous to the position of physiological instinct, which is immediately rooted in the stuff of the organism and, with its psychoid nature, forms the bridge to matter in general. In archetypal conceptions and instinctual perceptions, spirit and matter confront one another on the psychic plane. [1969a [1946]:215–216]*

Jung certainly did not intend to produce an ontological dualism between the psyche and the material world, for he held that these are but two aspects of the same reality—hence the spectrum metaphor rather than exhaustive and exclusive categories. Indeed, he would make statements denying that archetypes were anything other than our experience of the instincts; for example, “There is, therefore, no justification for visualizing the archetype as anything other than the image of instinct in man” (1959 [1951]). Yet he fervently wished to avoid the two snares of physiological reductionism—which was on the rise in psychology with the writings of Wundt and other behaviorists—and materialism, which had been on the increase in scientific thinking since the 19th century. He felt strongly that Freudian psychoanalysis had become mired in this kind of self-limiting and anti-empirical thinking—a conclusion with which we heartily agree.

Our bias should be clear enough to the reader by now. The archetypes are either inherent systems of neural circuitry, or they do not exist. It is as simple as that. As Jung himself wrote, archetypes have been “stamped on the human brain for aeons” (1953 [1943/45]:68–69; see also Stevens 1982). Lodging the archetypes in the brain does not mean that there are no spiritual contents or experiences mediating the archetypes or that there is no sublime dimension to reality. Quite the contrary, we are forced by the evidence to consider transpersonal, parapsychological, “spookily” causal, divine, and other spiritual elements in dream experience.<sup>7</sup>



#### ARCHETYPES IN EXPERIENCE

Read from the right perspective, the ethnographic literature is rich with evidence of the archetypes in action—in myth, in iconic symbolism, in visions, and especially in dreams. Newberg and D’Aquili (1994, see also D’Aquili and Newberg 1999) have presented an excellent analysis of the universal aspects of the *near death experiences* (NDE)—that is, as neurophysiological circuits that are “prepared” to erupt into consciousness under the right conditions:

*We hypothesize that in the complete NDE, two sequential archetypes are activated. The first we would call the archetype of Dissolution. In its full form, it is comprised of images of torture, hacking apart, burning and other horrifying conditions symbolic of the immanent death, fragmentation and dissolution of the corporeal self. This is followed by an activation of what we term the archetype of Transcendent Integration. It is this archetype which terminates the classic otherworld journeys in both the east and west and which comprises almost the entire experience of most contemporary NDEs. [6]*

The experience tends to be truncated and the positive NDE predominate in societies where there is a dominant expectation of an afterlife—for example, in Christian societies. These archetypes may operate in various states of consciousness in less dramatic and partial images, but:

*It is only in their full presentation in dream consciousness or in the hyperlucid consciousness of mystical visions that their “divine” or semi-divine qualities are fully manifest. It is in this sense that the archetype of Dissolution and the archetype of Transcendent Integration may be classified as mystical visions. (Newberg and D’Aquili 1994:12)*

The Naskapi of Labrador say that the essence of a person, what they call *Mista'peo*, or the "Great Man," lives in people's hearts (Speck 1963[1935]:34–35):

*The Great Man reveals itself in dreams. Every individual has one, and in consequence has dreams. Those who respond to their dreams by giving them serious attention, by thinking about them, by trying to interpret their meaning in secret and testing out their truth, can cultivate deeper communication with the Great Man. He then favors such a person with more dreams, and these better in quality. The next obligation is for the individual to follow instructions given him in dreams, and to memorialize them in representations of art.*

These representations are often geometrical patterns that show up in beadwork and other crafts done by native craftsmen. The Great Man is an example of what might be called the Teacher or Guru archetype. For the Naskapi, the appearance of the Great Man is consonant with their social structure in which elder males are considered to become wise and benevolent instructors. Both in the waking and dream lives, the ego of the individual grows by engagement with the archetype, and, in the case of dreaming, the archetype facilitates and guides individuation.

The question of archetypal dreams and their relations with the mythology and cycle of meaning of peoples cries out for a holocultural research (e.g. see Bourguignon and Evascu 1977). But to our knowledge only one such study has ever been done. In a cross-cultural study of Jungian archetypal motifs, Tiberia (1981:73) used the data from roughly 300 societies available in the Human Relations Area Files to collect some 62 archetypal dreams from 43 different cultures spread over seven world areas. Using an analytical methodology developed from Mattoon (1978), Kluger (1975), and Hall and Van de Castle (1966), she isolated the wide-spread cultural saliency of five archetypes: "the Archetypal Feminine" (e.g. The Great Mother), "the Self," "the Marriage," "the Ancestor Archetype," and "Losing Teeth." The first three archetypes were as described by Jung himself, while the last two were discovered in analyzing the cross-cultural data.<sup>8</sup> In order to share a flavor for this kind of dream as it is found across cultures, let us include a few examples of each of the five archetypal motifs:

1. The Archetypal Feminine: Referred to under different circumstances as the Great Mother or the anima, the archetypal feminine may present as either light or dark, benevolent or sinister, the Divine Mother or the Terrible Mother, and so forth (Neumann 1974). The transformations are endless, including radiant feminine figures, goddesses, succubae, mother

figures, nixies, sirens, and so forth (see Laughlin 2001). Kohler (1941:20) recorded the dream of a Zulu man who encountered a naked, black woman who was suckling snakes from her many breasts located over her body—for him a positive experience. In contrast, Elwin (1991[1947]:483) reported this Devouring Mother dream from a Muria man from central India:

*A beautiful woman came to my children and said to them, "I am going to devour you, because your parents give me nothing to eat." The next day my children fell ill, and the Siraha [medium] declared that their sickness was due to Lagar Deo [chief goddess], who was angry that the customary offering to him 3 years after the first child had not been made, and she therefore wanted to kill all my children. So I dedicated two pigs to Lagar Deo to be allowed to wander freely and killed 3 years later. Once I had done this my children recovered.*

Batchelor (1927:100) told of a dream by an Ainu man who encountered "an old woman wearing a seal-skin coat and smoking a long pipe" and sitting on the hearth. He then imagined he heard somebody calling him and began to get out of bed, but the old woman shoved him back down. He believed the old woman had been in fact the Goddess of Fire and that she had come to save his life (see Neumann 1974:285 on the Goddess of the Hearth motif).

Lincoln (1935:227) recorded a dream by a Navajo man who recalled this dream some 18 years after it had happened:

*I was in the mountains in a sort of cañon. On the top of the mountain there was a plane. I found an old arrow sticking in a bush. While looking at the arrow I saw something flying towards me from the south. It landed ten yards from me. I thought it was an eagle, but the eagle changed into a white lady who started walking up to me. She was wearing a white gown. In her left arm she was carrying something that looked like veils. She walked up close to me and every time she came close to me, I tried to protect the arrow. Then the lady spoke to me. When I was a boy, I used to have an eagle pet and the lady said to me, "I am the eagle you used to have." She said she wanted one turquoise bead with a hole in it. When I looked for my beads, they weren't there. I started for home to get it, but I woke up before I got there.*



2. The Marriage: In Jungian psychology, the Marriage expresses the merger of the ego with one's cross-gender opposite—the male ego with the anima, the female ego with the animus. The affective state of mind expressed by marriage is one of love. Curiously enough, Tiberia (1981:102) found that in all the cases she encountered across cultures, the marriage motif in dreams was associated with death. This makes sense in Jungian terms; for, “the marriage, or the union of opposites, is a state in the individuation process which involves a kind of psychic death for the ego in that it must integrate new perspectives that have formerly been totally unconscious” (Tiberia 1981:105). Peoples of the Rif in the Middle East; the Zulu in southern Africa; the Kol, Gond, and Bhils people of India; Bulgarians; Samoans; and Yacatee Maya all associate dreams of marriage and marriage ceremonials with negative things happening, including death (Tiberia 1981:102).
3. The Self: The archetypal Self is of particular relevance considering recent interest in the social construction of the self, and the “constructivist” denial of the self as either archetypal or a unifying property of the psyche (e.g. Mageo 2003). For Jung, the Self is that of totality and wholeness towards which the psyche strives but often fails to realize. It is the expression of the entire psychic being, not merely the ego. Self images in dreams may be abstract symbols, such as mandalas, or figurative symbols such as heroes, gods, squared circle landscapes, and so forth. Tiberia found that Self dreams were uniformly associated with “divine guidance, and the bestowal of power and blessings from beyond” (1981:90–91). Again, the variety of imagery illustrates the flexibility of transformation and cultural influences operating in archetypal dreams. The following examples of Self dreams are taken from her study.

A.L. Kroeber (1902/1907:432) reported the dream of an Arapaho Indian man who was given guidance:

*He saw himself standing alone on a green prairie...On his left...he saw a person seated, dressed entirely in black silk. He thought that this person was the messenger....Then this person in black spoke to him. He knew all the man's thoughts. He told him of the new world that was to be, and that they were now on a cloud. Then the informant saw the earth below him and the sky above him at an equal distance. The person in black, who was the crow, then showed him a rainbow extending from east to west, and another from south to north. The informant was then taken by him to the spot where the two rainbows crossed one another. There he stood, and the crow told him to look up. He then saw where the father was, and saw the thoughts of all mankind reaching up to him.*

A Bedouin commander once prayed for a dream before a battle. "Allah's spokesman" appeared to him and said, "Thy booty is to be a cushion of a litter fastened with a ... rope" (Musil 1928:396–397). He didn't understand the dream and told his fellows about it the next morning. Later in the day they attacked a camp and the commander, "found himself before the chief's tent where the 'Atfa litter was standing, in which in times of danger the prettiest girl used to be seated in order to encourage the defenders to fight bravely and hold their ground." The commander then understood the dream, and, roping the litter to his saddle, hauled off "their most precious possession, for once the 'Atfa litter is lost it must not be used again."

An Ojibwa Indian dreamed of Jesus (Jenness 1935:48).

*After I returned from the war I was ill and unable to do a hard day's work. One night I dreamed that Jesus approached me clothed in a loin cloth and with bleeding wounds as He appears in pictures. I threw myself at His feet and asked for a blessing. Then I awoke and told my friends that Jesus had blessed me and was restoring me to health. I recovered my health and am now as strong as ever.*

As with any archetype, the transformations within the dreams may vary endlessly. A Comanche Indian woman (Jones 1972:39) meets a man "who extends his hand while holding a peyote button in his palm. Once she takes the peyote from his hand and holds it with both hands she feels a tingling sensation through her hands and arms that she identifies with 'supernatural power'" (Tiberia 1981:97). An Ashanti man in West Africa (Rattray 1927:196) who dreamed he encountered a:

*Very tall person with an enormous head....This person carried three balls of medicine around his neck, one was red, one was white and one was black. The dreamer cried out in his sleep and was awakened. The next day the dreamer went to see a priest who said that the figure in the dream was his "father's god ...who had come to visit." He was advised to sacrifice a fowl and did so. [Tiberia 1981:96]*

4. The Ancestor: Tiberia discovered two archetypes in the cross-cultural data that Jung himself had not covered. The Ancestor was one of them and is surely one of the most common motifs among the world's dream cultures (1981:106):

*A total of 22 dreams from 19 separate cultures in six world areas had as their central symbolism the figure of the "ancestor." Such dreams are always interpreted according to the particular features of the dream itself in one of two ways: either as signifying imminent death or as bringing a message from the visiting spirit. That is, sometimes the ancestor proffers helpful information, makes a request or merely visits, and in other cases the ancestor attempts to entice the dreamer or a member of his/her family into the realm of the dead.*

Among the ancestor dreams examined by Tiberia are the following. A woman from the Aymara of Bolivia reported that, "Last night I dreamed of my husband, just as he was before [he died]. To dream of souls is not a good thing. Sometimes they come to advise us of some misfortune. Sometimes they come to take us away so that we, too, will die" (Tschopik 1951:215). Blackwood (1935:578) described the dream of a Buka woman from the Solomon Islands who traveled to the land of the dead and who encountered her mother. This was considered to be a positive experience, and she was glad to see her mother again. Blackwood noted that, "one man said to dream of the dead means that the dead man wants to speak to you, another that it is a sign that the dead wish you to join them." Among the Zulu, "the spirits often warn people in dreams against unsuspected enemies, or against coming dangers, but they may also cause them to be ill and die....Dreams sent by the ancestral spirits can always be recognized, for they mostly come with a message from the dead" (Krige 1965:286).

Many ancestor dreams seem to issue what Tiberia (1981:110) labeled as "a call of the dead." A Havasupai Indian man occasionally dreamt of his dead parents and friends and did not enjoy the experience:

*When I wake at dawn, I find I am not dead, I am still alive, and I want to sleep again, but peacefully. I say to the dead, "I am not dead, I only saw you dead people. I am still alive. I want to sleep well so I can get up in the morning refreshed." It is bad to dream of the dead; I do not want to dream of them; so go away. [Spier 1928:334]*

A Gros Ventre Indian man from Montana dreamt about his dead nephew who came to him and said, "You are not enjoying your life here. Where I came from is a good place." He replied that he had business to complete, and three days after the dream he became sick. He reflected that:

*I thought a lot about the dream I have just told you. I nearly concluded that it might mean my time to die would come in the winter season. I*

*am not afraid. I am resigned. If I live through next winter, I feel I will go past the crisis and live longer.* [Cooper 1956:413]

5. **Losing Teeth:** The most curious archetype discovered in Tiberia's research is dreaming of losing, breaking, or illness of the teeth—a motif given only passing attention by Jung (1969e [1948]:283). What makes the motif doubly curious is that it, too, is related to death. In Iran, dreaming of “a tooth which bleeds means the death of a member of the family; a tooth which does not bleed means the death of a friend; an incisor or a canine means the death of a close relative; a molar means the death of a distant relative; loss of all one's teeth means that death is near at hand for the dreamer himself” (Massé 1938:252). In a reversal of normal left right attributions, the Kogi people of Columbia consider the dream of losing a right tooth means the dreamer's father will die, while losing a left tooth means one's mother will die (Reichel-Dolmatoff 1949–1950:288). The interesting question is, why should the loss of teeth be associated with death? Tiberia (1981:117) floated the idea, taken from the Chukchee culture, that teeth may be associated with the soul—“losing of one's teeth is psychologically equivalent to losing the power to defend oneself against death” (Bogoras 1904–1909:491). An additional case comes from the Muria people of India. Elwin (1991[1947]:483) reported that, “At Palmar, the Suel once dreamt that he was climbing up a huge stone. Suddenly he saw a *chaprasi* [messenger], he was frightened and tried to run away. He fell down and broke his teeth. When he awoke he found he had fever and only recovered after he had sacrificed a pig and made other offerings.”

Thus, we see that archetypal dreaming is quite distinctive compared to more common, everyday “day-residue” dreaming. They are essentially transpersonal (expand the domain of information available to the ego), often numinous, and frequently related through the people's dream culture to their mythology, mythopoetic symbolism, and ritual. In studying the archetype in action, it is crucial not to take a simplistic, essentialist stance, for the archetypes themselves—in biogenetic structural terms, the *neurognostic structures* of the brain (Laughlin and d'Aquili 1974)—are not observable (apart from research using neurosurgery and neuroimaging). Only the imagery that is influenced by both the brain structures and the dreamer's culture are on display. They are each and every one of them transformations of the archetype as experienced directly in the dream, and the memory of the dream is often permanent and may have a profound impact upon the dreamer's life (Tiberia 1981:94).



#### ARCHETYPES IN MYTH

Another repository of archetypal symbolism is myth. Biogenetic structuralists have dealt with myth in various ways over the years, usually as it relates to ritual enactment (D'Aquili 1983, 1986; Laughlin et al. 1979:29–40) and experience (Laughlin et al. 1990). A myth is a special kind of story that functions as an expression of a people's world view (Kluckhohn 1959; Count 1960). Because a world view is an understanding of reality carried about in peoples' heads, myths and the telling of mythic stories is a “psychosocial” projection of world view onto narrative (Fox 1994). Intact traditional world views tend to be cosmologies—they describe the world as a system in which everything is causally entangled and has a role to play in the dynamics of the whole (Campbell 1988). Myths tell about aspects of the cosmology, and because they are the result of the brain's imagination, they also express the internal dynamics of the psyche (Levi-Strauss 1978; Laughlin and Throop 2001).

Mythical thought and dreaming are interconnected and no doubt have been since at least Upper Paleolithic times (Weibe 2004:205–207). As far as we know, Lévi-Strauss never took up the study of dreams in any serious way. However, others that followed his methods have done so. Premier among them is the work of the British social anthropologist Adam Kuper, who, in a series of important articles, sketched out a structuralist method for analyzing dreams (Kuper 1979, 1983, 1986; Kuper and Stone 1982). Taking his lead from Lévi-Strauss' analysis of myth, Kuper (1979:645) noted that, in many societies, myth and dreaming interpenetrate—or, as ethnographer Kenelm Burridge put it for the Tangu people of New Guinea, “much of the content of dreams tends to become articulate in myths, and myths, or parts of myths, are retold in dream” (1972:129; see also Eggan 1955; Brown 1992; Kracke 1992).

Jung was very aware of the intimate relationship between myth and dreaming, for he observed similar *mythologems* (mythic motifs) arising in the dreams and fantasies of mental patients and occurring in mythologies (1968a:33, 1969a:311). Early on in his career, he became aware that mythological systems were ubiquitous to cultures and showed similarities of patterning across cultures (Shamdasani 2003:214). He concluded that myths express the “structural elements of the psyche” (1968b:151). As Stevens (1983:37) noted:

*Jung knew that people needed myths if they were to remain vitally in touch with the archetypal core of their nature. Myths provide an entire cosmology compatible with a culture's capacity for understanding, they establish a transcendent context for our brief existence here on earth, they validate the values which rule our lives, they ensure that cohesion of cultures and the worth of individuals by releasing an archetypal response*

*at the deepest levels of our being, and they awaken in us a sense of participation in the mysterium tremendum et fascinans<sup>9</sup> which pervades the relationship between the cosmos and the Self.*

Because the archetypal structure of the human brain has evolved over tens of thousands of generations of adaptational selection, mythologems reveal our own invisible and unconscious mental structures both in our dreams and in myths, and through those structures the cosmos (1974:79).<sup>10</sup> Jung wrote, “Just as the archetypes occur on the ethnological level as myths, so also they are found in every individual, and their effect is always strongest, that is, they anthropomorphize reality most, where consciousness is weakest and most restricted, and where fantasy can overrun the facts of the outer world” (1968b:67). Our conscious will is “weakest” when we dream and are absorbed in fantasy. It is not surprising, then, that our special dreams are rife with mythologems and mythological thought (1956:22–23, 390). Mythologems are “condensed” bundles of archetypal meaning—symbols that, as Cassirer (1957) would say, are “pregnant” with meaning and polysemic in reference. In action their specific meaning shifts with the dynamics of context, both in myths and dreams (1968b:152–154). As Jung notes (1956:390):

*Modern psychology has the distinct advantage of having opened up a field of psychic phenomena which are themselves the matrix of all mythology—I mean dreams, visions, fantasies, and delusional ideas. Here the psychologist not only finds numerous points of correspondence with myth-motifs, but also has an invaluable opportunity to observe how such contents arise and to analyze their function in a living organism. We can in fact discover the same multiplicity of meanings and the same apparently limitless interchangeability of figures in dreams.*

Despite the fact that dream narratives may be shared and quickly forgotten while myths are retained and transmitted down through the generations (Tedlock 1999:91–92), there is no structural reason to treat dreams and dream narratives differently. Traditional myths are never just invented, they are experienced. They are the spontaneous eruptions of unconscious operations into consciousness where they may be retained in memory and set into story form (1968b:154). Thus, for Jung, the best way to understand the story unfolding in the special (“big”) dream is through the study of mythology—particularly the mythology of the dreamer’s own culture (1968a:33). The same psychic structures that produce mythical thought also produce archetypal dreams (1968b:6–7), a fact that is especially evident in the dreams of very young children (1954:44–45).



## CONCLUSION

Except in the eyes of diehard constructivists and postmodernists, Jungian thought, theory, and phenomenology is a rich source of potential ethnological study—especially using holocultural methods, comparative ethnographic methods, and cross-cultural psychological research. We are *not* advocating yet another subdiscipline of anthropology (such as psychological anthropology or the anthropology of religion) but rather that a Jungian approach can enrich all of the subdisciplines of sociocultural anthropology. Among other things, a Jungian anthropology of consciousness will counter the constructivist view that the individual consciousness of self and world is primarily formed during enculturation. As we have shown, consciousness is “already there” in the structuralist sense. Consciousness is rudimentarily archetypal and develops in interaction with self and the external world throughout life.

A Jungian anthropology could (and in our opinion should) be grounded in the neurophysiology of archetypal structures that underlie and mediate a rich variety of symbolic forms (i.e. should be considered as neurognosis; Laughlin et al. 1990). The Hero or Heroine (or Protector) for instance is ubiquitous to mythopoeic systems around the globe (see Campbell 1949). The Hero takes endless forms, depending on the culture in which he or she is depicted. Be it Beowulf or Superman, Athena or Wonder Woman, the Hero is that part of the self that stands on guard to ward off or balance the destructive forces in the world and chthonic upheavals from the depths of the psyche, and expresses itself in stories, dramas, and rituals in virtually all cultures.

A Jungian approach to symbolic and experiential culture has the advantage of allowing the ethnologist to move seamlessly from religious institutions (shamanism, mythology, ritual) and artifacts (drama, iconography, art, landscape) to the reports of direct experiences (dreams, drug trips, visions) of individuals while applying the same system of explanatory concepts.<sup>11</sup> Moreover, because Jungian psychology (unlike the structuralism of Levi-Strauss) is inherently developmental and biopsychological in its framework, it is amenable to modification in response to empirical research. As findings and theories in the neurosciences continue to evolve, a Jungian approach to symbolic analysis and explanation can change accordingly. A Jungian anthropology is thus a powerful perspective that can bridge between the unappealing limitations of essentialism and the antiscientific excesses of constructivism.



NOTES

1. Charles D. Laughlin is an emeritus professor of anthropology and religion in the Department of Sociology & Anthropology, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario, CANADA K1S 5B6. He is coauthor of *Biogenetic Structuralism*, *The Spectrum of Ritual and Brain*, *Symbol and Experience*, and *Communing With the Gods: Dream Cultures and the Dreaming Brain*. He has done ethnographic fieldwork among the So (Tepes) of Northeastern Uganda, Tibetan lamas in Nepal and India, Chinese Buddhists in Southeast Asia, and the Navajo of the American Southwest.
2. Vincenza A. Tiberia, Ph.D. is an American licensed psychologist who has been practicing cross-cultural psychology in Kuwait since 1998. She completed her doctorate in Professional Psychology at the School of Human Behavior at United States International University in San Diego, California in 1981 and is currently licensed as a psychologist in California, Florida, and Switzerland. Dr. Tiberia specializes in Jungian oriented psychotherapy and has published works on Jungian archetypal theory.
3. Citations are of Jung's work, except where another author is cited.
4. Jung did not invent the idea of deep structure by any means, but rather inherited the idea from Goethe who developed the notion of "ur-phenomenon" (Ger: *Urphänomen*; see Seamon 2005), as well as from the writings of Bastian.
5. Of relevance to the anthropology of dreaming is his view that dreams are as vivid, complex, and interesting as the waking world—a view he held in common with peoples from polyphasic cultures (Cahen 1966; Marjasch 1966; Laughlin 2011).
6. This is a remarkable intuition on Jung's part, considering the later work done by Ernst Gellhorn and his associates on the role of the autonomic nervous system in mediating spiritually significant affect (see Gellhorn 1967; Gellhorn and Kiely 1972; Gellhorn and Loofbourrow 1963; Lex 1979; Laughlin et al. 1990:313–318).
7. Laughlin has elsewhere suggested the possibility of quantum interactions between neural systems—including archetypal neural systems—and the quantum universe. The archetypes are species-typical structures made up of living cells that may well communicate with each other and with the universe at the level of quantum interactions (Laughlin 1996, 2011:Chap. 4).
8. Robert Knox Dentan (1986:325) also isolated a number of content "uniformities" in dreams cross-culturally, including morbidity, feces for money, and falling teeth.
9. Loosely, "the great mystery that is at the same time frightening and fascinating" (e.g. see Luke 2:8–9).
10. Jung (1953:147–148, 1956:22–23) held, as do we (see also Gould 1977; Ebbesson 1984), that our phylogenetic past is reflected to some extent in our neurocognitive ontogenesis.



11. Victor Turner became interested in applying this approach toward the end of his career (see Turner 1983; E. Turner 1986).

## REFERENCES CITED

- Batchelor, J.  
1927 *Ainu Life and Lore*. Tokyo: Kyobunkwan.
- Blackwood, Beatrice  
1935 *Both Sides of Buka Passage: An Ethnographic Study of Social, Sexual, and Economic Questions in the North-Western Solomon Islands*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Bogoras, H.  
1904-1909. *The Chukchee*. New York: G.E. Stechert.
- Bourguignon, Erika, and T.L. Evascu  
1977 Altered States of Consciousness within a General Evolutionary Perspective: A Holocultural Analysis. *Behavior Science Research* 12(3): 197-216.
- Brooke, Roger, ed.  
1999 *Pathways into the Jungian World: Phenomenology and Analytical Psychology*. New York: Routledge.
- Brown, Michael  
1992 Ropes of Sand: Order and Imagery in Aguaruna Dreams. In *Dreaming: Anthropological and Psychological Interpretations*. Barbara Tedlock, ed. Pp. 154-170. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bulkeley, Kelly  
1994 *The Wilderness of Dreams: Exploring the Religious Meanings of Dreams in Modern Western Culture*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Burridge, Kenelm  
1972 Cargo. In *Mythology*. Pierre Maranda, ed. Pp. 127-135. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Cahen, Roland  
1966 The Psychology of the Dream. In *The Dream and Human Societies*. G.E. von Grunebaum and R. Caillois, eds. Pp. 119-143. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Campbell, Joseph  
1949 *The Hero with a Thousand Faces*. New York: The World Publishing Co.
- Campbell, Joseph  
1988 *The Power of Myth*. New York: Doubleday.
- Cassirer, Ernst  
1957 *The Philosophy of Symbolic Forms*. Vol. 3: *The Phenomenology of Knowledge*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Cooper, John M.  
1956 *The Gros Ventres of Montana, Part 2: Religion and Ritual*. Washington: Catholic University of America.

- Count, Earl W.  
1960 Myth as World View. *In* *Culture in History*. S. Diamond, ed. Pp. 580–627. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Damasio, Antonio  
2010 *Self Comes to Mind: Constructing the Conscious Brain*. New York: Pantheon.
- D'Aquili, Eugene G.  
1983 The Myth-Ritual Complex: A Biogenetic Structural Analysis. *Zygon* 18(3): 247–269.  
1986 Myth, Ritual, and the Archetypal Hypothesis. *Zygon* 21(2): 141–160.
- D'Aquili, Eugene G., and A.B. Newberg  
1999 *The Mystical Mind: Probing the Biology of Religious Experience*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Dentan, Robert Knox  
1986 Ethnographic Considerations in the Cross-Cultural Study of Dreaming. *In* *Sleep and Dreams: A Sourcebook*. Jayne Gackenbach, ed. Pp. 317–358. New York: Garland Reference Library.
- Dourley, John P.  
1984 Jung and the Coincidence of Opposites: God, Universe and Individual. *University of Ottawa Quarterly* 54(2): 37–51.
- Ebbesson, Sven O.E.  
1984 Evolution and Ontogeny of Neural Circuits. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 7: 321–331.
- Edinger, Edward F.  
1972 *Ego and Archetype: Individuation and the Religious Function of the Psyche*. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons.  
1985 *Anatomy of the Psyche: Alchemical Symbolism in Psychotherapy*. La Salle, IL: Open Court.
- Eggan, Dorothy  
1955 The Personal Use of Myth in Dreams. *American Anthropologist* 57: 445–453.
- Elwin, V.  
1991[1947] *The Muria and Their Ghotul*. Bombay: Oxford University Press.
- Fox, Robin  
1994 Myth as Evidence of Psychosocial Processes. *In* *Psychological Anthropology*. Philip K. Bock, ed, Pp. 211–229. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Gellhorn, Ernst  
1967 *Principles of Autonomic-Somatic Integration*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Gellhorn, Ernst, and W.F. Kiely  
1972 Mystical States of Consciousness: Neurophysiological and Clinical Aspects. *Journal of Nervous and Mental Diseases* 154: 399–405.
- Gellhorn, Ernst, and G.N. Loofbourrow  
1963 *Emotions and Emotional Disorders*. New York: Harper and Row.

- Gould, S.J.  
1977 *Ontogeny and Phylogeny*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Hall, Calvin S. and Robert L. Van de Castle  
1966 *The Content Analysis of Dreams*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Haule, John Ryan  
2010 *Jung in the 21st Century, Volume 1: Evolution and Archetype*. New York: Routledge.
- Hillman, James  
1985 *Archetypal Psychology: A Brief Account*. Dallas, TX: Spring Publications.
- Hobson, J. Allan  
1988 *The Dreaming Brain*. New York: Basic Books.
- Hunt, Harry T.  
1989 *Multiplicity of Dreams: Memory, Imagination and Consciousness*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Hunt-Meeks, Swanee  
1983 The Anthropology of Carl Jung: Implications for Pastoral Care. *Journal of Religion and Health* 22(3): 191–211.
- Jenness, Diamond  
1935 *The Ojibwa Indians of Perry Island: Their Social and Religious Life*. Ottawa: National Museum of Canada Bulletin No. 78, Anthropological Series No. 17.
- Jones, David E.  
1972 *Sanapia: Comanche Medicine Woman*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Jung, C.G.  
1953 [orig. pub. 1943/45] *Two Essays on Analytical Psychology*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.  
1954 *The Development of Personality*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul. (Collected Works No. 17).  
1956[1912] *Symbols of Transformation: An Analysis of the Prelude to a Case of Schizophrenia*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul (Collected Works No. 5).  
1959[1951] *Aion: Researches into the Phenomenology of the Self*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press (Collected Works No. 9).  
1965[1961] *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*. New York: Vintage Books.  
1968a[1944, revised 1958]. *Psychology and Alchemy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, (Collected Works No. 12).  
1968b[1934, revised 1954] *Archetypes of the Collective Unconscious*. In *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*. Pp. 3–41 (Collected Works No. 9). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Jung, C.G.  
1968c[orig. pub. 1936/37]. *The Concept of the Collective Unconscious*. In *The*

- Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious. Pp. 42–53 (Collected Works No. 9). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- 1968d[orig. pub. 1936]. Concerning the Archetypes, with Special Reference to the Anima Concept. *In* *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*. Pp. 54–72 (Collected Works No. 9). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- 1968e[orig. pub. 1940]. The Psychology of the Child Archetype. *In* *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*. Pp. 151–181 (Collected Works No. 9). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- 1968f[from 1930 lecture]. Concerning Mandala Symbolism. *In* *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*. Pp. 355–384 (Collected Works No. 9). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- 1969a *The Structure and Dynamics of the Psyche*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. (Collected Works No. 8).
- 1969b [1949] Forward. *In* *The Origins and History of Consciousness*. Erich Neumann, ed. Pp. xiii–xiv. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- 1969c *Mandala Symbolism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- 1969d[orig. pub. 1919] Instinct and the Unconscious. *In* *The Structure and Dynamics of the Psyche*. Pp. 129–138 (Collected Works No. 8). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- 1969e[orig. pub. 1952]. Synchronicity: An Acausal Connecting Principle. *In* *The Structure and Dynamics of the Psyche*. Pp. 417–519 (Collected Works No. 8). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- 1970 [1955/56] *Mysterium Coniunctionis: An Inquiry into the Separation and Synthesis of Psychic Opposites in Alchemy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press (Collected Works No. 14).
- 1974 *Dreams*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Kluckhohn, Clyde  
1959 Recurrent Themes in Myths and Mythmaking. *Daedalus* 88: 268–279.
- Koepping, Klaus-Peter  
1983 *Adolf Bastian and the Psychic Unity of Mankind: The Foundations of Anthropology in Nineteenth Century Germany*. St. Lucia: University of Queensland Press.  
2007 Bastian and Lévi-Strauss: From ‘Entelechy’ to ‘Entropy’ as ‘Scientific’ Metaphors for Cultural Teleologies. *In* *Adolf Bastian and His Universal Archive of Humanity: The Origins of German Anthropology*. Manuela Fischer, Peter Bolz, Susan Kamel, and Emily Schalk, eds. Pp. 23–31. Zürich: Georg Ohms.
- Kohler, M.  
1941 *The Izangoma Diviners*. Pretoria: Union of South Africa Government Printer.
- Kracke, Waud H.  
1992 “Myths in Dreams, Thought in Images: An Amazonian Contribution to the

- Psychoanalytic Theory of Primary Process." *In Dreaming: Anthropological and Psychological Interpretations*. Barbara Tedlock, eds. Pp. 31–54. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Krige, Eileen Jenson  
1965 *The Social System of the Zulus*. Pietermaritzburg, South Africa: Shuter and Shooter.
- Krippner, Stanley, Fabiba Bogzaran, and André Percia de Carvalho  
2002 *Extraordinary Dreams and How to Work with Them*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Kroeber, A.L.  
1902/1907 *The Arapaho*. American Museum of Natural History, Bulletin 18: i–xiv, 1–229, 279–466.
- Kuper, Adam  
1979 *A Structural Approach to Dreams*. *Man (NS)* 14(4): 645–662.  
1983 *The Structure of Dream Sequences*. *Culture, Medicine and Psychiatry* 7: 153–175.  
1986 *Structural Anthropology and the Psychology of Dreams*. *Journal of Mind and Behavior* 7(2-3): 333–344.
- Kuper, Adam, and A.A. Stone  
1982 *The Dream of Irma's Injection: A Structural Analysis*. *American Journal of Psychiatry* 139: 1225–1234.
- Laughlin, Charles D.  
1996 *Archetypes, Neurognosis and the Quantum Sea*. *Journal of Scientific Exploration* 10(3): 375–400.  
2001 *Mandalas, Nixies, Goddesses, and Succubi: A Transpersonal Anthropologist Looks at the Anima*. *International Journal of Transpersonal Studies* 20: 33–52.  
2011 *Communing with the Gods: Dream Cultures and the Dreaming Brain*. Brisbane: Daily Grail.
- Laughlin, Charles D., and Eugene G. d'Aquili  
1974 *Biogenetic Structuralism*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Laughlin, Charles D., and C. Jason Throop  
2001 *Imagination and Reality: On the Relations Between Myth, Consciousness, and the Quantum Sea*. *Zygon* 36(4): 709–736.
- Laughlin, Charles D., John McManus, and Eugene G. d'Aquili  
1979 *Introduction*. *In The Spectrum of Ritual: A Biogenetic Structural Analysis*. Charles D. Laughlin, Eugene G. d'Aquili, and John McManus, eds. Pp. 1–50. New York: Columbia University Press.  
1990 *Brain, Symbol and Experience: Toward a Neurophenomenology of Human Consciousness*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Levi-Strauss, Claude  
1978 *Myth and Meaning*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

- Lex, Barbara W.  
1979 The Neurobiology of Ritual Trance. *In* *The Spectrum of Ritual*. Eugene G. d'Aquili, Charles D. Laughlin, and John McManus, eds. Pp. 117–151. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Lincoln, J.S.  
1935 *The Dream in Primitive Culture*. London: Cresset.
- Mageo, Jeannette Marie  
2003 Theorizing Dreaming and the Self. *In* *Dreaming and the Self: New Perspectives on Subjectivity, Identity, and Emotion*. Jeannette Marie Mageo, ed. Pp. 3–22. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Marjasch, Sonja  
1966 On the Dream Psychology of C.G. Jung. *In* *The Dream and Human Societies*. G.E. von Grunebaum, and R. Caillois, eds. Pp. 145–161. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Massé, H.  
1938 *Croyances et coutumes persanes* [Persian beliefs and customs]. Paris: Librairie Orientale et Americaine.
- Mattoon, M.A.  
1978 *Applied Dream Analysis: A Jungian Approach*. Washington DC: Winston and Sons.
- Musil, Alois  
1928 *The Manners and Customs of the Rwala Bedouins*. New York: American Geographical Society, *Oriental Explorations and Studies* 6.
- Neumann, Erich  
1969 *The Origins and History of Consciousness*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.  
1974 *The Great Mother*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Newberg, Andrew, and Eugene G. D'Aquili  
1994 The Near Death Experience as Archetype: A Model for “Prepared” Neurocognitive Processes. *Anthropology of Consciousness* 5(4): 1–15.
- Parkin, David and Linda Stone, eds.  
2004 *Kinship and Family: An Anthropological Reader*. London: Blackwell.
- Pinker, Steven  
1997 *How the Mind Works*. New York: Norton.  
2003 *The Blank Slate: The Modern Denial of Human Nature*. New York: Penguin.
- Rattray, Robert Sutherland  
1927 *Religion and Art in Ashanti*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Reichel-Dolmatoff, Gerardo  
1949-1950 Los Kogi: Una tribu de la Sierra Nevada de Santa Marta, Columbia [The Kogi: A tribe of the Sierra Nevada de Santa Marta, Columbia] (Volume 1). Bogota, Columbia: Instituto Ethnologico Nacional, *Revista* 4: 1–319.

- Seamon, David  
2005 Goethe's Way of Science as a Phenomenology of Nature. *Janus Head* 8(1): 86–101.
- Shamdasani, Sonu  
2003 *Jung and the Making of Modern Psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Speck, Frank G.  
1963 [1935]. *Naskapi: The Savage Hunters of the Labrador Peninsula*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Spier, Leslie  
1928 Havasupai Ethnography. *Anthropological Papers of the American Museum of Natural History* 29(3).
- Stevens, Anthony  
1982 *Archetypes: A Natural History of the Self*. New York: William Morrow.
- Tedlock, Barbara  
1999. Sharing and Interpreting Dreams in Amerindian Nations. In *Dream Cultures: Explorations in the Comparative History of Dreaming*. David Shulman and Guy G. Stroumsa, eds. Pp. 87–103. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Throop, C. Jason, and Charles D. Laughlin  
2007 Anthropology of Consciousness. In *Cambridge Handbook of Consciousness*. P. D. Zelazo, M. Moscovitch, and E. Thompson, eds. Pp. 631–669. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Tiberia, Vincenza Antonette  
1981 Jungian Archetypal Themes in Cross-cultural Dream Symbolism. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, School of Human Behavior, United States International University. Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International.
- Tschopik, H.  
1951 The Aymara of Chucuito, Peru: Magic. *Anthropological Papers of the American Museum of Natural History* 44(2): 1137–1308, plus plates.
- Turner, Edith  
1986 The Genesis of an Idea: Remembering Victor Turner. *Zygon* 21(1): 7–8.
- Turner, Victor  
1983 Body, Brain, and Culture. *Zygon* 18(3): 221–245.
- Van de Castle, Robert L.  
1994 *Our Dreaming Mind*. New York: Ballantine.
- Weibe, Donald  
2004 Critical Reflections on the Modes of Religiosity Argument. In *Theorizing Religions Past: Archaeology, History, and Cognition*. Harvey Whitehouse and Luther H. Martin, eds. Pp. 197–213. Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira.
- Young, David E.  
1994 Visitors in the Night: A Creative Energy Model of Spontaneous Visions. In *Being Changed by Cross-Cultural Encounters*. David E. Young and Jean-Guy Goulet, eds. Pp. 166–194. Peterborough, ON: Broadview Press.