

## **The Symbol theory in S. Freud, C. G. Jung and C. S. Peirce**

Salvatore Settineri<sup>1</sup>, Emanuele Maria Merlo<sup>2</sup>, Fabrizio Turiaco<sup>1</sup>,

Carmela Mento<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Biomedical and Dental Sciences and Morphofunctional Imaging, University of Messina, Italy

<sup>2</sup> Psychological Doctor, University of Messina, Italy

<sup>3</sup>Department of Cognitive Sciences, Psychology, Educational and Cultural Studies (COSPECS), University of Messina, Italy.

Email Corresponding author: [manuzip@gmail.com](mailto:manuzip@gmail.com)

### **Abstract**

The work is aimed at studying three points of view, whose convergences and conflicts deepen the theme of the symbol, where the same faces to the psychic life full of meaning. The process of signification of objects in fact, provides an opportunity for knowledge of the psychic life of the subjects. As the product of mind, therefore, the attention falls, from semiotics, on the meanings of the dynamic psychology, whether it is psychoanalysis or analytical psychology. In this sense, from a phenomenological and semiotic approach, based on Peircean mode of existence of the sign, the

analysis continues with the theme of the return of the Freudian symbol to converge to the common and different aspects of Jungian analytic theory. The convergent products of the different approaches, in fact, provide the ability to grasp what regardless of theory and hermeneutics, remains in the clinical context through the possibility of profound contact with the subject.

Key words: Semiotics, Symbol, Phenomenology, Dynamic Psychology, Analytical Psychology.

### The symbol in Charles Sanders Peirce

An approach related not only to semiosis, but to production of meaning is suggested by Charles Sanders Peirce and his writings gathered in *Collected Papers* (Peirce, 1974). The term semiosis indicates that the object studied by the theory is not only the sign, but the process of creating meaning. Semiotics considers the capacity, due to the action of the signs to generate other signs, where the most complex of them manifests the meaning. Thinking, as a semiotic process, evolves and develops as a result of a triadic relation between representation of logical elements that define the semiotic mediation, the sign called representamen, the object and the interpreter (Michel, M., & Andacht, F., 2016). The semiotics of Charles Sanders Peirce puts its emphasis in the relationship between subject and object as experiential event, through which the mind of the subject becomes interpreting. Semiotics is based on a Phaneroscopy, a form of phenomenology that was so called to make a difference from Hegel's *Phenomenology of Spirit* (Hegel, 1863). Peirce's semiotics is inseparable from his phaneroscopy: his reflection on the sign is based on the three categories of feeling, existence and mediation. The sign is a representamen (Bourdin, 2005). The object exists on his own, regardless of the interpreter's need, may be more or less perceptible and knowable to us through the sign. This is the necessary condition for the sign to take shape, so the object can be known.

The subject gives to his own mind the features of interpreting, and produces a unique emersion of contents. The interpreter is the subject that

refers to the attempt of object's expression, through the mediation of the sign. He is the person who make the interpretation through his mind. This mental process of reception and sign generation is called interpreting.

The contents become signs when the interpreter approaches the object in relation to the same interpretation. Therefore, it is necessary to establish what is an object, which is the function of interpreting and what kind of unconscious emergence occurs through the phenomenology of sign.

#### The Sign and its moments of existence

The notion of sign finds, in the dynamics of the work of Peirce, a major attention than just the description of the categories. The triad of the sign distinguishes between three classes of existence of the sign, respectively Firstness, Secondness, and Thirdness.

The idea of Firstness is the idea of the present instant, which is naturally thought as a point in time, without reference to anything else so just qualities of feeling or appearances as well. While firstness implies a purely qualitative aspect, which Peirce defines as pure feeling, the secondness implies an experience that usually forces you to think; it is compared to a second, but without any regard to any third part.

Thirdness connects a second and a third in relation to each other; for Peirce in any triadic relationship there is always a mental element. These categories proposed by Peirce are reflected on the sign classes that he proposed and in particular on the second "trichotomy of signs" that includes icon, index and symbol, respectively connected to firstness, secondness and thirdness. From this point of view, we must consider the thought of Peirce, who proposes a project in which the study of meaning has ontological value, which allows to connect icon, index and symbol (Bourdin, 2005).

#### Sign classes

Icon *"An icon is a sign that refers to the object that it denotes merely by virtue of his characteristic, that it owns in any case, independently if it exists or not. One thing, whatever is a quality or an existing individual, or*

*a law, is an icon of something, if it is similar to that thing and it is used as a sign of it* “(Peirce, 1931-1958, p.140).

For Peirce, the icon is a sign more degenerated, it holds the highest degree of degeneration because his “virtue of meaning is simply due to its quality”. The icon has only the material quality of the sign function. The icon refers to the object by virtue of their characteristics, regardless of any relationship (Bourdin, 2005).

Index *“The index is a sign that refers to the object that it denotes by virtue that it is actually determined by that object (...) if the object acts on the index, the index has necessarily some qualities in common with the object and is compared to these qualities that the index refers to the object* “(Peirce, 1931-1958, p.140).

Compared to the icon, index has a more real connection with the object. Both the index and the icon are degenerate signs, before the interpretation. The index refers really to the object: for example, smoke is an indication of fire (Bourdin, 2005).

Symbol *“A symbol is a sign which refers to the object that it denotes by virtue of a law, usually an association of general ideas, which operates so that the symbol is interpreted as referring to that object”* (Peirce, 1931-1958, p.140).

The symbol is the construction of a replica that is of a different nature and whose relationship with the object is not direct but mediated (Bourdin, 2005). A symbol is a genuine sign, because it expects the intervention of the interpretant in its real constitution. Though Peirce specifies that his theory is an “abstraction from psychology”, the categories that he produced, are suitable to be transposed to the field of depth psychology. This hermeneutical leap is likely to be transposed in clinical psychology as long to make a transposition, which inevitably implies a reinterpretation of these categories for the purpose of their application.

### Abduction and unlimited semiosis

Peirce's observations provide interesting insights also on the issues of thirdness and abduction. Based on the so-called "theory of reduction," the author suggests that relations can be established only on the basis of a triadic relationship, since the monadic and dyadic are not enough to allow the construction of a relationship "not degenerated". Only the triadic relationship can produce emergence: the third allows the development of emerging material more than the simple sum of the parts. Also in this case, it is possible a transposition from the scope of semeiotics to that of psychoanalysis, highlighting the importance of the third in the development of the psyche. About abduction, Peirce focuses on its distinction between induction and deduction. In deduction, the conclusion automatically derives from the premises: the result simply makes explicit what was already implicit in the premises and just note it. In induction, the rule is hypothesized starting from a case and a result.

This is the reverse process of deduction: it is based on the assumption that certain regularities observed in a phenomenon will continue to be observed in the same form in the future. Differently from deduction, induction it is not logically valid without external confirmations. Abduction involves a simple supposition and carries a strong risk of error, but it is the only one that allows us to increase our knowledge, because it permits to imagine new ideas, to guess, and to predict. Peirce considered abduction as the first step of scientific reasoning: through it, a hypothesis is established to explain certain empirical facts. Abduction, as induction, does not contain within itself its logical validity and it must be confirmed empirically.

The confirmation will never be absolute, but only in terms of probability: you could affirm to have played a correct abduction if the rule that you have chosen to explain the result receives so many confirmations that the probability it is the right amounts of a reasonable certainty, and if there are no other rules useful to explain the observed facts. The practical application of these concepts refers to consider that when you expose the subject to the stimulus of the projective tests, if you would generate a projection and categories of firstness and secondness are excluded,

thirdness will be a not degenerate relation, an original and free projection of unconscious material that could be considered an abduction. The abductive process is thus a genuine reaction and relationship, does not degenerate, the projection on which is based on the methodology of the reactivities. The symbols here analyzed in psychoanalytic key, are designed as the result of such interpretative instances, proposed here by transposing Peirce's semiotics and pragmatism to clinical practice.

The attribution of meaning coinciding with the symbolization would reach through the narration, a deep psychological uniqueness. This process, drawing the minds of others, would generate a second interpreter subject to the same process of interpretation. This second symbolization becomes necessary not only for explanatory purposes of the narrative, but also for the establishment of a relationship of symbolic exchange and for the dyadic emergency of relation. In order to evolve the meeting, the relationship and the contact in what Peirce called Unlimited Semiosis, it is necessary that the symbolic relationships exist. As the term suggests, the continual eddies of second symbolizations from the previous ones, would make the unlimited semiosis' character, so much so that moving away from a first immanence, another symbolization transcend from primarily attributed meanings.

#### Peirce's Contribution in Psychology

Peirce's logic of the basic texts of semiotics (Peirce, 1987) concerns analysts because it is a third thought (Bourdin, 2005). Lacan held in high regard the thought of Charles Sanders Peirce, citing it eleven times in his workshop in 1960, in which he talks about his definition of the sign, and up to 1977 on the subject of logic between 1968 and 1971, about logical or semiotic triangle in 1972 and 1974, and about logic and Trinitarian or ternary relationship in 1976 and 1977. André Green refers to Peirce for thirdness because Peirce, on the one hand, suggests the firstness (affection) understood as "the heart of the matter", the dyadic report to the circularity and the compulsion and the triadic relationship that allows symbolization.

The semiotics of Peirce's works seem to have attracted attention, in reference to the Dialogical Self Theory (Hermans and Kempen, 1993),

where the proposal of several authors to insert semiotic aspects, recalls Peirce's work.

In particular, a well-known attempt is related to Raggatt's work (2010), who proposed a model that would integrate the triadic semiotic with the dialogic model of the Self. In connection with this work, Michel and Andacht (2016), were asking the aim of exposing more explicitly something not quite explored by Raggatt, namely the interrelationship between the phenomenological categories of semiotics of Peirce. The theoretical conception here implied is the one of the post-positivist realism, seen as the context that involves itself as an element of dialogue in training, for self-interpretation, in the meeting with the other as the basis of its genesis (Bakhtin, 1986). The process of self-interpretation hopes for the full symbolization, since pathological aspects are revealed when autonomous elements hide their entirety to what is called the Self biophysical (Wiley 1994), not landing in the Peirce sense of thirdness, and clarifying the relationship between the different levels of pragmatism and the Self dialogism (Wiley, 2006).

#### The symbol in Sigmund Freud

With reference to the study of the symbol in dynamic psychology and the role that it covers, according to the origins of meaning, we can notice a difference in psychoanalysis and analytical psychology. The etymology of the term symbol for Freud refers to an object that is meaningful when the two sides where the origin was divided are reunited; from the Greek  $\sigma\upsilon\nu$  (= with, together) and  $\beta\alpha\lambda\lambda\omega$  (= jet): put together. In ancient times, this reunion operation had the meaning of recognition and belonging, like the slave to his master, or the link between families.

In fact, this remains in the psychoanalytic meaning of the symbol, today as yesterday. The Freud matured studies in reference to the evidence that the basis of hysterical symptoms was not necessarily due to a traumatic event

of sexual mold. In this sense then, the disease was more oriented by a sexual representation in childhood, representing the psychic fact as the event itself. Managing the case of Elisabeth von R. (1892), Freud elaborated the equation symptom = mnestic symbol. For psychoanalysis, then the symbol is equivalent to a representation of something, that as inaccessible manifests itself symbolically through the symptomatology. Such representations would suffer from removing latent contents, a direct result of their unacceptability; the need to emerge into consciousness and the inability to do so while keeping their authentic nature, raised the need to study the equivalence due to the postponement. In Freud the symbol as a phylogenetic heritage is integrated into the design of a symbolic function attributable to ontogeny. It 'may notice the semantic value of Freud which reduces the symbol "sign of elementary instinctive processes" (Jung, 1969) in line with the need reductive natural sciences referenced by the rigorous methodology.

#### The symbol in Carl Gustav Jung

In analytical psychology, the term "symbol" is understood according to a different view, whereas the psychoanalysis assimilated symbol to sign, based on the common elements. As the sign means something with something else (*aliquid stat aliquo*), the symbol, while maintaining the semiotic element of referring, is not directed to a particular reality determined by a convention but to reconstruction of something whole, as dictated by the etymology of the word. Before the interpretation of unconscious fantasies was structured as if they were signs of impulses, unacceptable for the conscience. For Jung these fantasies are, if properly interpreted by the Ego, again psychic symbols. In reference to this, therefore, we realize the constructive and absolutely open character of analytical psychology, certainly closer to a conception of Hegelian Historical Becoming, rather than Being, determined and devoted to the past of traditional science (Gembillo, 2009), subject to repetition, while the it would return to the signs of the aberrant Nietzsche's Eternal Return. Therefore, the contradiction between psychoanalysis and analytical



psychology, opposites witnessed by the functions of Psychological Types (Jung, 1921) and the different conception expressed in Transformation of libido, it becomes an occasion of breaking.

But as already suggested, the contradiction is not a conclusion but a creative dimension, if the transcendent function becomes capable of overcoming the opposition of which the psyche is formed, through the production of symbols. The aim of such a function would be that of “identification”, tending to the adaptation process that is expressed in a phase of distinction of opposites, from which is made a “step back”, and in an integration. (Jung, 1912).

For Jung, and therefore for analytical psychology, symbols mean more than it can be found find at first sight. They find their meaning in compensation and integration. If, then, we trace back the symbols to something else, it becomes impossible to interpret the sense (Jung, 1983,). For Jung, symbols are not a crucial bridge between conscious and unconscious. For this reason, Jung attributes to the Freudian concept an almost primitive immanence of the mental functioning. Jung, in fact, includes in the symbolic field mythology and religions as elder structures of mental functioning (Colman, 2011). The idiosyncratic definition of Jung excludes that symbols can be treated as mere signs (Colman, 2011). He defines in symbols in agreement with Jung, as the best possible description of unknown facts (Jung, 1921).

The psychoanalytic conception, therefore, loses strength, in the moment in which the symbols theorized by Freud are presented as individual experience, having crossed the consciousness and being, therefore, mere signs. The articulation of the symbolic in Jung consists of a completely different origin, deriving from the collective, and the subject is unable to conceive its knowledge, since experience is lacking.

From this new theory comes the inexpressibility of the symbol, rather than its conceptualization as an unacceptable representation. Failing psychoanalytic causality, the symbol becomes teleological factor, thus

tends to the becoming, randomly unknowable and “a priori” determined, not expressing the ambiguous and in itself poorly understood.

*“For symbol, I do not mean an allegory, or a simple sign ... A symbol does not embrace and does not explain, but it mentions, beyond himself, to an even transcendent meaning, inconceivable, dimly sensed, that the words of our current language cannot adequately express”* (Jung, 1926 p. 360-361). The topic of reference is changed, therefore, where originally Freud goes from the manifest to the latent, and Jung “in this way to further participation of the sense that the incompleteness of this sense refers” (Galimberti, 1996).

Every man is a symbol, Platone in the *Convivio* defines it as a fragment of the whole man, tension towards an absent entirety, but remembered by the incompleteness of the sense of the present situation. Distinguishing between symbol and sign, Jung may partly escape from causal order and deterministic natural science to move toward the meanings of the plan, which is precisely the phenomenological human science based on which symbol carries within it its meaning: the symbol is an expression.

For Jung, a symbol is alive as long as it is full of signification, but when it gives birth to the signification, *“that is, when you find the expression that shows the thing wanted or expected in a better way than the used symbol, then the symbol dies, thus, it has only a historical value”* (Jung, 1921 pag. 484). The symbol, as intimately linked to the unconscious, is testimony to its emergence needs. The ability to determine the new meanings is the prerogative of consciousness, but when we are in presence of a closure of consciousness, the contents are reduced to the immanence of the past: therefore, for Jung: *“The patient of today is all too prone to conceive as a symptom also what is full of meaning”* (Jung, 1921, *Psychological Types*, p. 488). A different opening of consciousness allows an attitude inherently teleological by its nature, so that knowing the origin of a psychic product, we can understand to where it tents, as for the purposes of the transcendent function of intuition (Jung, 1921). Where the causal approach shall guarantee the mere acceptance, the becoming is supported by teleology.

The symbolic function in a dream, therefore is not affected by “*aliquid stat pro aliquo*”, and not responding to the closure of the referral to the sign, the dream would represent a psychic rebalancing, compensatory and also as a forerunner of future events, for advances and process that the symbol allows in the becoming of the subject, as clarified in *Man and his symbols* (Jung et al, 1991). Psychopathology consists of a different signification in these terms: it would be a poor communication between the conscious and the unconscious, whose divisions are pathology.

Aniela Jaffe processes the symbolism in visual arts (Jaffé, 1983), firstly by examining the symbols of stone circle and animals and which magical and propitiatory function have had through art; then, she suggests that the twentieth century art itself is a symbol (Jung et al, 1991). The animation of primitive stone idols would become the projection of unconscious contents. Its use is recurrently proven in different cultures and religions in rocks and caves, places of worship, validated by rock paintings not simply as a short-lived exercise of style, but as functional to propitiation. Moreover, the identification with the animal used as a totem should be considered. Through the mask, conferred with the ritual of initiation and circumcision, the individual becomes an archetypal image, accepting from it the qualities and terrific aspects.

The symbol of the circle, used in all cultures and in all ages, is universally recognized as the essential aspect of life. In Japanese Zen philosophy, it represents enlightenment and human perfection, and we find it in the Indian mandala, and in Christian art and architecture. In the same work (Jung et al, 1991), Marie-Louise von Franz explores the concept of the individuation process and how it will be reconstructed by drawing a map of the progressive individual dreams. From the general scheme, which can be extrapolated from complex plot, can be identified those modifications that mark the passage from the personal evolution; each interpretation is possible only in relation to the dreaming subject, to his psychic life, considering the Self as an organizer of this process, a secret guide who speaks to us through dreams, if we succeed to abandon Ego utilitarian

projects, to make place in our inner journey toward our center, a path that generally begins through a wound and the consequent suffering.

The knowledge of limits becomes a contact with the Shadow and with the critics of the unconsciousness, it leads to discover the real psychic dimensions, revealing a positive form of an aspect of the Self so feared, as it happens by exploring the different aspects of Anima and Animus and showing the relation with the emotional experience experimented with the parent of opposite sex. Often it is symbolized in different cultures, as a bisexual being to symbolize the integration of masculine and feminine, the synthesis of opposites.

Even the Self is represented as an animal that embodies all the characteristics, realizing the instinctual nature and the relation with the environment. Another constant symbolization of the Self resides in stone or crystal of tombstones. Von Franz reminds us that from the association between mind and matter has born the Jung's theory of synchronicity, in which he argues that events belonging to the psyche and external events have a significant coincidence and then a symbolic message, which would accompany the stages of the individuation process.

Either the Self has its dark side and can be illusion, which can take shape in megalomania and pride, in religious ritualistic blindness. Jolande Jacobi brings us awareness of how important is the exploration of dream symbols, in the psychoanalytic path, considering these as a symbolization of the real treasures offered to consciousness, to give a chance to the individual's maturation. The Self is meant as an emergent phenomenon arising from existing dynamics in a complex system that includes the infant's psychological characteristics, intentional attributes of the caregiver, and the symbols of the cultural characteristics that determine development. The symbol can thus be seen as a discrete and important address of autonomy, an element of a dynamic system (Hogenson, 2004).

The definition of Jungian Self, which comes with its work in maturity, describes the self as a conceptualized wholeness (Jung, 1959), that in a world full of dynamic systems theory, we can define as a higher-level organizational principle, which dominates the system of psyche, as well as

the system psyche – world. Through the subjective processing of symbolizations produced within the dream context, it is possible to bring discomfort to consciousness and make life more functional, although the explanation of the dream language too openly could cause discomfort and activate defense mechanisms, not useful to therapeutic progress.

Jung says:

*“My speech is imperfect. Not because I want to shine with words but out of the impossibility of finding those words, I speak in images. With nothing else can express the words from the depth’s.”* (Jung 2009, p.230).

It is clear that each symbol must be interpreted in relation with the patient, but some issues may give an indication fairly reliable. Contrasting Freud’s thesis that the dream was the fulfillment of a pulsion, Jung proposed the consideration of unconscious self-representations attested by the symbols (Jung et al, 1991).

Table 1- Symbol, interpretative table.

<i>Symbol for Freud</i>	<i>Symbol for Jung</i>	<i>Symbol for Peirce</i>
<p>Freud assimilates the symbol to the sign, on the base of the common element of cross-reference, as a sign of the elementary instinctive processes, in accordance with the explanatory - reductive necessity. It would be the rigid guarantor of a direct forwarding between the representations. That allows for a direct connection between unacceptable representations. The symbol belongs to the signs, because there is a constant and identifiable relationship between the symbol and the symbolized. It follows the logic of "aliquid stat pro aliquo", joining representation and symbol. It acquires meaning when the two parts in which they are divided into origin are reunited. To the knowledge of the representations, it would arrive through symbolic manifestations</p>	<p>For Jung, the symbol, if on the one hand maintains the element of forwarding, on the other hand is not directed to a particular reality, but to the reconstruction of an integer. The subject of forwarding is modified from the present to a participation of a later meaning, of non-exclusively individual origin. The collective and therefore the transversality in reference to the human, is witnessed by the archetypal legacy that transmits the symbol. The symbol is independent of mere forwarding, because it finds its meaning, provided they are included, in compensating and integrating. Lacking the net causality, the symbol would be the teleological factor, tending to the end of</p>	<p>For Pierce the symbol is a genuine sign, since it provides for an intervention of the interpretant and therefore of the mental subjectivity in its very constitution. As such, it maintains the semiotic record of forwarding, but it removes its degeneration, as subordinate to the existential needs and singularities of the interpreter. It prevents the degeneration of the other kinds of signs by being a source of thirdness, so it allows a unique and unrepeatable significance. The irreducibility and its specific characteristics, not fully explicable, allow a semiotic act always becoming and unlimited. The contact with the symbol, produced by the interpreting mind, influences the successive and potential</p>

<p>like the symptoms, actions that are missing and the jokes. The symbolic conception takes the characteristics of the equation: Symptom = mnemic symbol. The symbols are presented as individual experience, having crossed the consciousness. The symbolizations that have phylogenetic factors would be exclusively existence of archaic residues.</p>	<p>becoming and unknowable casually, as determined a priori. The symbol would be intimately connected with the unconscious, a witness of its need to emerge. The dream symbol would be a psychic rebalancing, compensatory and even precursor for the catalysis that allows in the teleological becoming of the subject. The dream symbol covers the function of witness of self-representations of the individual and collective unconscious.</p>	<p>interpreters, to the point of allowing semiotic evolution. Abductive notes support the evolutionary variations of the symbol itself, allowing for always updatable declinations. The purpose of interpretation of the symbol, avoids determinism a priori, insofar as the symbol reveals and inspires its infinite and unlimited singularity.</p>
---	--	--

What is common to authors, in particular in all fields, even in reference to psychoanalysis, is the theme of referring, despite the fact that it assumes different meanings. In this case, the cross-reference, central in the Freudian conception, crosses the explanatory intention of Peirce and Jung. The vision of an Oedipus that lives the figure of the father as a third and refers to the thought of Peirce, is suggested by Botella (2005). The article argues that the consideration of the Freudian second topic, which defines the pulsional energy in the form of the Es, in which there are no representations and in which the pulsion is effective, as a pulsional movement and implies a revision of the theory of the Oedipus. In these terms, since prior to the Freudian conception, cross-reference allows a direct link between unacceptable, and thus eliminated, representations and

what, escaping deforming censorship, reaches consciousness as a symptom or a failed act. This concept is present in Peirce as well, which agrees with Jung regarding utility, but not with the universality and the singularity of it. In fact, for Peirce, the mere cross-reference of the sign to the object is a kind of sign that undergoes degeneration. Defining degenerate signs that remain in the forward (icon) or in a minimal form of thought inspired by a resistance (Index), Peirce identifies degeneration on the basis of the absence of a third, which would give the phenomenon the characteristics of the symbol. The interpreting mind of the subject, having relations with an object, if it did not give rise to the emergence, would not support the thirdness, not arriving on top of the sum of the parts; that is the explanation of degeneration.

The higher degree of degeneration, represented by the icon, would support the logic of “*aliquid stat pro aliquo*”, coming exclusively from the qualities of the object. This coincidence fully respects Freud’s intentions, which would guarantee symptomatic mnemonic equivalents. In analytical terms, Jung, in addition to the symbol itself, comes closer to Peirce’s conception of the object theme. The object of Jung lives the similarity with the epistemology of Kant, in which the psychic work that would create the experience, would be comparable to what happens with the synthetic judgments *a posteriori*. The object, that in Peirce exists independently from the prerogatives of the subject, becomes knowable by the sign.

Like unconscious products, which come to consciousness through the true symbol, responsive to cross-reference, but not chained to that, abandoning degeneracy, it becomes third. The symbol of Jung, therefore, as the symbol of Peirce, is a powerful source of knowledge, considering it as a symbol and not as a Freudian sign or as the degenerated classes of the icon and of the index of Peirce. The coincidence of the Jung symbol with the class of the genuine sign presupposes an emersion of meaning that would support a teleological vision, aimed at becoming, and not merely at being. In this sense, therefore, the genuine symbol that requires the real participation of the interpreting mind confers to the interpreter subject the subjective prerogatives of realization of his unconscious.



The icon becomes, then, pure description linked to the cross-reference, the index becomes the effort hampered by the resistance, worked by the defenses, to reach a deeper level and the symbol becomes the contact with the inner world, insofar as the same symbols appear in the dream and are not directly related to the origin. In psychological terms, this would equate the hermeneutic measure and the subject's ability to have relations with his or her own inner world, in the event that these issues are brought closer to clinical practice.

There are three degrees that the subject can reach for Peirce, who, almost transversally, with a pragmatic vein, traces a continuum that covers the founders of psychoanalysis and analytical psychology from the Freudian symbol, that has for Peirce a degenerated nature, to the genuineness of the Jung symbol, which coincides with the true symbol. The symbol of Jung, being genuine, would be properly described by the author as coherent with the dynamics of becoming, with the processing of images, with the need for meaning, and, finally, as a catalyst for one of the most subjective concepts in Peirce: an unlimited semiosis. By being certainly close to Kant's later synthetic judgment, the object experienced by the subject, which gives rise to a posteriori judgment, at the moment of symbolization becomes a merely subjective record. Being this process disposed to repetition, far from compulsions, a new subjectivation is favored by the tendencies of thirdness of the symbolization of a new interpretant.

If other subjects approached the object symbolized before, the semiotic process of signification would be unlimitedly projected, where such fineness of conception would blindly capture the logics of the Hegelian becoming, close to the conception of Jung and distant from Freud's punctual-shaped being, linked to the cross-reference to the sign. This conception of Jung and Peirce would undoubtedly be closer to a hermeneutic intention that would be transversally applied to the human being, where a work linked to more positivist conceptions, such as those of psychoanalysis, excluded from the scope of their studies such typical human manifestations.

Conclusions

The discussion on the fine modes of existence and significance of the classes of signs implies several points of view, since from plurality and cultural heat can be extracted the intellectual deviation that changes epistemological reality, as understood by the complexity By E. Morin. He says: "The analysis of what is known and how it is known becomes the examination of the biopsychosocial context, in which the relationship of assimilation is also a relationship of conflict, where the existence of a cultural and intellectual life of dialogue, the cultural heat, the possibility to express deviations are three conditions that mobilize and release energies (Morin, 1993, p. 31).

The beginning of the work seems to be linked to the work of Peirce, as an occasion of phenomenological, semiotic and category foundation of what in analytical psychology has been simply defined as the best possibility of description of unknown facts. Not coincidentally, being included in the hermeneutic perspective of dynamic psychology, to study the symbol, whether it is authentic or closer to the degeneration of the first kinds of sign, is the study of a product.

As a representation of what takes place, in terms of psychic depths, being those exquisitely unique and personal or more widely conceived as archetypal, this is prefigured as a vehicle of knowledge. The scientific and epistemological purpose implies the clinical relational field, since the processes of signification, that the subject put into action, are declined on the basis of the needs of contact, for the evolution of a perspective of becoming and transformation that so distinguished C.G. Jung from the existential static conception that refers to mere forwarding.

The examples given in the present work also refer to a comparison of living and current themes, as expressions of human existence. These aspects unlike monistic conceptions and positivist realism, evolve with the human being, whose objective is to become again whole, through

signification and individuation process. The necessity, therefore, is not to see only in a clinical perspective to achieve an objective of knowledge and

of contact, that subtly an author of the stature of Peirce has in common with the capacity of innovation of Freud and the complexity of Jung.

### References

1. Bakhtin, M. (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays*. (V. W. McGee, trad.), Austin, TX: University of Texas Press. (Trabalho original publicado em 1961).
2. Botella, S. (2005). L'Œdipe du ça ou Œdipe sans complexe. *Revue française de psychanalyse*, 69(3), 717-729.
3. Bourdin, D. (2005). Logique, sémiotique, pragmatisme et métaphysique. *Revue française de psychanalyse*, 69(3), 733-747.
4. Colman, W. (2011). Symbolic objects and the analytic frame. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 56(2), 184-202.
5. E Morin, *Le idee: habitat, vita, organizzazione, usi e costumi*, tr. it A. Serra, Milano, Feltrinelli, 1993, p. 31
6. Freud, S., *Studi sull'isteria e altri scritti, 1886-1895*, Opere, 1, Bollati Boringhieri, Torino 1967.
7. Galimberti U., *Psichiatria e fenomenologia*, Feltrinelli, Milano, 1996.
8. Gembillo, G., Gembillo, G., & Gembillo, G. ,2009, *Da Einstein a Mandelbrot. le Lettere*, p.203.
9. Green André, *Idées directrices pour une psychanalyse contemporaine*, chap. 5: « Configurations de la tiercéité », Paris, PUF, 2002, pp. 249-267.
10. Hermans, H., & Kempen, H. (1993). *The dialogical self: meaning as movement*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

11. Hogenson, G. B. (2004). What are symbols symbols of? Situated action, mythological bootstrapping and the emergence of the Self. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 49(1), 67-81.)
12. Jaffé, A. (1983). Il simbolismo nelle arti figurative. JUNG, Carl.
13. Jung C. G., (1983), L'albero filosofico, trad. it. Boringhieri, Torino, cit., p. 74.
14. Jung C. G., La funzione trascendente, in *Opere*, Boringhieri, Torino, 1969, volVIII. p.89.
15. Jung C. G., Spirito e .vita, 1926, in *Opere*, Boringhieri, Torino 1969, vol. VIII. p.360-361.
16. Jung, C, G, (1921). Psychological Types. CW 6.
17. Jung, C, G, (2009). The Red Book. (Liber Novus). Ed. S. Shamdasani. New York & London: W.W. Norton.
18. Jung, C. G. (1959). Aion: Researches into the Phenomenology of the Self. CW 9ii.
19. Jung, C. G., von Franz, M. L., von Franz, M. L., & von Franz, M. L. (1991).L'uomo ei suoi simboli. J. Freeman (Ed.). Tea.
20. Jung, C. G.,1912. Simboli della trasformazione. *Opere di Carl Gustav Jung*.
21. Jung, C. G.,1921, Tipi Psicologici, *Opere*, vol. VI, Boringhieri, Torino., pag. 484.
22. Lacan Jacques, Le Séminaire, Livre VII : L'éthique de la psychanalyse (1959-1960), Paris, Le Seuil, 1986, séminaire du 13 janvier 1960.
23. Lacan Jacques, Le Séminaire, Livre XIX : .Ou pire (1971-1972), séminaires des 1er et 21 juin 1975.
24. Lacan Jacques, Le Séminaire, Livre XV: L'acte psychanalytique (1967-1968), inédit: séminaires des 7 et 28 février 1968.

25. Lacan Jacques, *Le Séminaire, Livre XXIII: Le sinthome (1975-1976)*, séminaire du 16 mars 1976.
26. Lacan Jacques, *Le Séminaire, Livre XXIV: L'insu que sait de l'une-bévue s'aile à mourre (1976-1977)*, séminaire du 11 janvier 1977.
27. Michel, M., & Andacht, F. (2016). Passos para uma convergência de duas teorias dialógicas do self. *Psicologia USP*, 27(2), 246-254.
28. Morin, E., & Serra, A. (1993). *Le idee: habitat, vita, organizzazione, usi e costumi*. Feltrinelli.
29. Peirce C.S. (1931-1958), *Collected papers*, Harvard University Press, MA p.140.
30. Peirce, C. S. (1974). *Collected papers of Charles Sanders Peirce (Vol. 5)*. Harvard University Press.
31. Peirce, C. S., Fouchier-Axelsen, B., Foz, C., & Savan, D. (1987). *Textes fondamentaux de sémiotique*. Collection d'épistémologie.
32. Raggatt, P. (2010). The dialogical self and thirdness: a semiotic approach to positioning using dialogical triads. *Theory & Psychology*, 20(3), 400-419.
33. Wiley, N. (1994). *The semiotic self*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
34. Wiley, N. (2006). Pragmatism and the dialogical self. *International Journal for Dialogical Science*, 1(1), 5-21.