

### Editor's Note

Archetypal psychology has consistently encouraged what Patricia Berry here calls "interpretative self-awareness." Using the dream as guide, Berry shows us that theory is what we actually practice, and that for archetypal psychology the crux of both practice and theory (and who knows the difference?) is becoming aware of our assumptions toward the imaginal. We cannot simply assume this or that about the image, she says, but must find ways to "interpret our own interpretations" lest we unknowingly slight the image or fail to follow its lead.

Berry notes that for the alchemists *theoria* included "praying, reading, and thinking in relation to what they were doing." Following this lead, how might we relate our psychological theories to the primary material of archetypal work, i.e. the image? This is Berry's theme—how to craft psychological theories according to the precise facticity of the image, taken here as dream. "Our basic premise," says Berry, "is that dream is something in and of itself... an imaginal product in its own right."

Berry shows how many of psychology's usual approaches to the image can quickly become departures, leaving the image behind as they move on to draw implications from the image and make suppositions about it. And she shows how these latter steps can distance psychological theory from a proper basis in the image.

How, then, do we proceed? How do we approach an image with the respect and propriety due something having its own integrity? How do we acknowledge in our theories, and thus in our practice, that the image is irreducible and infinitely more interesting than anything we might say about it? Berry suggests that one way might be a *via negativa*, a negative road leading back to the image through "a recognition of unsuitable moves." Here is a theory that tracks the archetypal motto first sounded by Raphael Lopez-Pedraza and echoed by archetypal theorists ever since: "We must stick to the image!" Berry's is a radical and well-mannered approach designed to defend the image against the narrowing moves of interpretation, many of which have become almost second nature to the analytic mind.

Read this essay carefully, and then read it again. Berry, a poet in addition to her work as a psychoanalyst, gives us a seamless presentation in which every word urges a tempering of theory such that we might give the imaginal its due.

## AN APPROACH TO THE DREAM

PATRICIA BERRY

(Spring 1974)

*But every psychic process, so far as it can be observed as such, is essentially theoria, that is to say, it is a presentation; and its reconstruction—or "representation"—is at best only a variant of the same presentation.*

—CW 17, § 162

Once upon a time a Jungian analysand appeared for her hour strangely distraught. It seems she had had occasion to show someone else a dream she and her analyst had worked on in a previous session, and then was so unsettled with the disparity of interpretation that she had rushed off for a third and then a fourth opinion. All differed essentially. Dream interpretation, she now charged, was a pseudo-science and interpreters mere charlatans.

Although this parable can reflect a number of problems about analysis, and this sort of analysand in particular, it also gives cause for some theoretical reflection about dreams. Of course any dream has a variety of possible interpretations; of course each analyst has his particular biases, approaches, and assumptions. But still, aren't some interpretations more to the point somehow than others? Let's take a look at her dream:

I was lying on a bed in a room, alone apparently, but with the feeling of turmoil around me. A middle-aged woman enters and hands me a key. Later a man enters, helps me out of bed and leads me upstairs to an unknown room.

We may imagine a variety of Jungian analysts and the sort of interpretation each might give for this dream:

1) *ego-active analyst*: The whole dream is characterized by your ego passivity. You are reclining, a rather unconscious position, which makes for the feeling of unconscious turmoil. Without effort of your own, you take what is handed to you. You are led away by the animus, therefore, up into yet another area of passive fantasy.

2) *relationship-feeling analyst*: You're alone in a room; isolated and cut off from your marriage, relationships, children. Never do you express feeling for or make any real contact with the other figures in the dream. Therefore, you are led into the upper regions with only your animus as companion, alone and remote, the princess in the tower.

3) *transference-oriented analyst*: You're in a half-conscious sexual position, in which the turmoil represents your unrecognized erotic projections. You fantasize various solutions: (a) the phallic mother, or (b) the man leading you upstairs to an unknown climax. One of these (depending upon sex) refers to your projection of me as your savior.

4) *animus-development analyst*: When you confront your turmoil, it becomes the middle-aged woman, your fear of growing old and unfruitful. But in that older woman you find the creative key which becomes then the unknown animus who leads you to the, higher room, i.e., to the unknown part of your psyche in which creative work can now take place.

5) *introvert analyst*: There you are at last alone with yourself, in the vessel. You receive now inner help. Your inner femininity gives you the key, the key being seclusion and facing the internal turmoil hitherto denied by your extraverted defenses and acting out. This leads you to the next step, the animus figure who helps you out of bed and leads you to another level.

6) *feminine earth-mother analyst*: You were lying passive, naturally, in touch with your real feelings (depressive position). Now you can receive gifts from the feminine, the positive mother. Unfortunately, as soon as the animus appears, you lose this connection by following him up into the intellect.

7) *process-oriented analyst*: It's not so much the content of the dream as the way you have introduced it into our session (that you told it to me in such an aggressive voice, that you waited until the end of the hour, that you handed it to me neatly typed and then leaned back passively waiting for an interpretation).

As we read these seven statements, how glaring the analyst's assumptions seem in some of them and how true or accurate in others. Yet any one of these perspectives could be derived from Jung's writings on the dream and none of them is necessarily wrong. We are not here concerned with "right" or "wrong" in regard to the above responses—rather why it is that we prefer one over another. We can avoid the problem by saying it all depends upon the patient's reaction—which interpretation "clicks" for him. But however practical this approach, it conceals an essential difficulty having to do with what might be called theoretical sensitivity.

We know from the comparative studies that have been done on theoretical schools and styles of therapy that virtually every therapy "works:" every therapy shows evidence of accomplishing the aims it sets for itself, and all fail to the same extent. Though not in itself surprising, the relativism of therapy in terms of results can lead to frightening consequences. It opens the way to an aspect of psychotherapy little different from charlatanism, syntonice transference neurosis, hysterical suggestion, doctrinal compliance, religious conversion, and political brainwashing. For these too "click," and in these too the subject feels himself changed for the better on the basis of insights revealed. Without a sensitivity among theories, it no longer matters what theory we have; one idea is as good as another, providing it works—and everything works equally. If there are better and worse theories about dream interpretation, they cannot be based on what "clicks"—for when we lose sensitivity here, we lose it in practice as well.

Furthermore, since our main mode of reflecting about what we are doing is by means of dreams, it is here of all places that becoming aware of our assumptions is of fundamental importance. It is the crux of our practice. The alchemists did not only perform experiments, they spent their time equally in a kind of *theoria*—praying, reading, and thinking in relation to what they were doing. In fact, to make practicality our determinant criterion is a kind of immorality, the sort we also see in the psychopath who says what works is therefore good. But rather than get too carried away with this charge against the moral cop-out of pragmatism, perhaps it would be more advantageous to turn to its contrary, the psychological importance of theory.

Because theory so determines practice—after all what we practice is theory—in order to be aware of what we're doing with dreams, we

have to become aware of what we're thinking about dreams. We have to examine not only how we put our theory into practice but also what we are putting into practice. This means turning to our assumptions and becoming aware of our unconsciousness in this realm too.

So what we will be elaborating in this paper is a tool (one among many) for more precisely grasping our underlying ideas when we look at dreams. Our intention is to work out some means for interpretative self-awareness, a method by which we may examine our actual interpretative process, interpret our own interpretations.

As we have maintained, methods have underlying assumptions, so this method too implies a theoretical position. Our basic premise is that dream is something in and of itself. It is an imaginal product in its own right. Despite what we do or don't do with it—it is an image.

## I. IMAGE

*We must stick to the Image!*  
—Rafael Lopez-Pedraza

Following Jung, by image we "...do not mean the psychic reflection of an external object, but a concept derived from poetic usage, namely, a figure of fancy or fantasy image..." (*CW* 6, § 743). In his passage Jung gives ground for a distinction between imagination and perception. A fantasy-image is sensate though not perceptual: i.e., it has obvious sensual qualities—form, color, texture—but these are not derived from external objects. On the other hand, perception has to do with objective reals—what I see is real and there. And so, by claiming external reality, hallucinations (psychotic or psychedelic) pertain to perception, whereas dream images pertain to imagination. The two modes, imaginal and perceptual, rely upon distinctly different psychic functions. With imagination any question of objective referent is irrelevant. The imaginal is quite real in its own way, but never because it corresponds to something outer. Though dream figures and places frequently borrow the visage of perceptual reality, they need not be derived from perception. As we read from Jung, images in our dreams are not reflections of external objects but are "inner images."

But why then, it may be asked, do we sometimes dream of figures from our perceptual world and at other times of figures never perceived?

Certainly the familiar figure must be some sort of after-image or *Tagesrest*. The traditional manner in which we deal with images that correspond with perceptual figures is to call them products of the personal unconscious and then seek to sort out the projections they carry for us. So far so good, for it seems what we're really doing is attempting to redeem these images from their perceptual imprisonment and to reclaim them as psychic, thereby shifting our standpoint from perceptual to imaginal.

But this cannot take place, our exit from this perceptual world becomes blocked, our movement stuck, when we deal with these so called personal figures on a personal level, forgetting that they are fundamentally fantasy-images cloaked in after-images. Personal figures are precisely those most bound to our literal perspective. When my spouse, children, or friend appear in my dream, they have become to some extent removed from the "reality" of the perceptual world with which they are so closely associated. The dream offers the opportunity to make metaphorical these figures, and thus the psyche may be seen as working toward the imaginal, away from the perceptual—repetitively and insistently. This movement may be regarded as the psyche's *opus contra naturam*, a work away from the natural reality of the perceptual toward the psychic reality of the imaginal.

Now we must look more closely at the kind of reality an image has. We have to examine with more exactitude just what we mean here by an image, and one of these ways is to take it apart, performing a kind of analysis of the image.

*Sensuality*: One reason why images so easily merge with the after-images of sense perception is that images too are sensate; images too imply a body of sorts. But this body is no more a perceptual "natural" body than are images derived from perceptual natural objects. The body to which images refer is metaphorical, a psychic body in which the sensory combinations and all the sense qualities of the image that would for perception be outlandish, incomplete, overwhelming, or distorted in some respect or other, here make sense.

*Texture*: The word text is related to weave. So to be faithful to a text is to feel and follow its weave. When we speak of putting a dream in its context, meaning with the text of the dreamer's life, we tend to neglect that the dream is sensate, has texture, is woven with patterns offering a finished and full context. The life situation need

not be the only means by which to connect the dream with this textual aspect. Image in itself has texture.

*Emotion:* Also inseparable from both sensuality and texture is emotion. A dream image is or has a quality of emotion. Dream moments may be expansive, oppressive, empty, menacing, excited... These emotional qualities are not necessarily portrayed verbally by the dreamer in his report, by the dream ego in his reactions, or by other figures in the dream. They adhere or inhere to the image and may not be explicit at all. Even if unrecognized by the dreamer in the dream, they are crucial for connecting with the images. We cannot entertain any image in dreams, or poetry, or painting, without experiencing an emotional quality presented by the image itself.

*Simultaneity:* An image is simultaneous. No part precedes or causes another part, although all parts are involved with each other. So we view the image level of the dream as non-progressive; no part occurs before or leads to any other part. We might image the dream as a series of superimpositions, each event adding texture and thickening to the rest. In the dream above we might then say that the horizontal dream ego, the woman with the key, and the man leading upstairs are all expressions essential to the psychic state; no one of them carries a secondary meaning. They are all layers of each other and inseparable in time. Such relationship we might express as while, or when. While the dream ego is lying alone in turmoil, a middle-aged woman hands a key and a man leads to an unknown room. It does not matter which phrase comes "first" because there can be no priority in an image—all is given at once. Everything is occurring while everything else is occurring, in different ways, simultaneously. Jung's emphasis upon the "present situation" need not be identified with the literal life situation, which removes the dream from the presence of the image, but also might be read to mean that every part of the dream is concurrently present.

*Intra-relations:* All the elements (characters, settings, situations) within a dream are in some sense connected. They are each part of the overall dream image, so that no part can be selected out, or pitted against the other parts. By this complete intra-relation of the dream we mean to point out the full democracy of the image: that all parts have an equal right to be heard and belong to the body politic, and that there are no privileged positions within the image. (This is not to

deny the innate hierarchies within the image, which we shall come to below under *Value*.) Let's look at an example showing how intra-relatedness appears in a dream image. A woman dreamed:

I am in bed when a funny little dwarf emerges from beneath the covers. He is shyly glancing at me as though he wants some sexual contact. Just at that moment my friend R. (a conservative, responsible, older man) appears at the door and urgently shouts, "Run!" as though I am in some great danger.

One way of viewing this dream would be to take the conservative friend R. and the tricky little dwarf as opposites between which the dreamer must choose. But this approach would be to fix them into opposition, to reinforce what is already the dream ego's experience. By taking into account the coincidence of the opposites (the *coincidentia oppositorum*), which is to say the total dream image in which all parts fit, however, we would see the panicked R. as actually constellated by the amorous dwarf, and vice versa. The two of them together are the image. In daily life, when the dreamer is connected to her dwarf creativity, trickiness, and so forth, her conservative, responsible animus panics and urges her to run, to cut herself off from the dwarf-like, lower aspects; and hence, the other way round, when the responsible animus is in a state of panic, somewhere, probably very unconsciously, an assignation with the dwarf is occurring. In daily life, she drops her purse, loses her keys, unconsciously creates misunderstanding... If we are to stick to this imagistic level of the dream, the point is to refrain from choosing between characters.

Frequently we must also hold a tension within settings. A man dreamed: "I walked into my mother's kitchen and saw an *Encyclopedia Britannica* on the counter." The image is his mother's kitchen within which is an encyclopedia. An immediate tendency would be to destroy this image by saying, for example, an encyclopedia doesn't belong in a kitchen, or that just shows his mother's animus. Whereas the former would be to betray the image altogether (for the most effective images do in fact conjoin the most unfitting opposites), the latter would be in itself an animus statement—a preconceived judgment. But by giving the image the recognition and dignity of a psychic product infinitely more profound than we, we may find ourselves stilled. Within his

mother's kitchen is an encyclopedia, or a toad, or a maimed old man. Already the psyche has done something, something is happening in his mother's kitchen. For him the point is to work on this image (and let this image work on him) in whatever imaginative/experiential ways he can—which requires putting into abeyance his judgment and interpretation.

*Value:* Some images seem more potent, more highly attractive than others. For example, the encyclopedia stands out strikingly in what appears an otherwise mundane scene. Often, as in this case, the attraction has to do with an unusualness of image and setting (a lion in the bathroom) or sometimes of the image itself (a winged snake). In both cases the images are “unnatural.”

When the dream presents an image that goes against the way things are naturally, let's assume such images to be of high value because they are examples of the *opus contra naturam*. As I understand Jung's idea of symbols, they change the course of nature and upgrade its energy to a higher value. Hence the unnatural, unusual, peculiar image is the one being singled out and the one containing most value.

There is another way of recognizing the value in dream images. Ordinary images may be invested with feeling, e.g., the little brown dog of my childhood or the scarf my mother gave me for Christmas. Here one needs discrimination among feelings—sentiment, kitsch, longing, nostalgia, expectation. . . The dream discovers the image of the feeling, exposing the feeling for what it is. So one may read the feeling through the image, as well as the image through the feeling. The dog or the scarf is not only of high value because I feel so strongly about it in my dream, but my dream also tells me where my strong feelings of nostalgia are located. To deal with one's more embarrassing feelings in a dream from a sentimental viewpoint is to miss the embarrassment and therefore the discrimination of the feeling quality.

The case is similar in those situations where one feels the urge to choose between, say, city and country, sky and earth, family home or own apartment. A dream may show the city as nerve-racking, the country as idyllic, the sky as fearsome, the earth as nurturing, the family home as complicated and petty, an independent apartment as self-contained and fulfilling. Yet each of these is a fantasy from the

point of view of the other. The city looks threatening just because of my idyllic fantasy and vice versa. To choose between one or another of these smaller images is to lose the larger one, which is, after all, a wholeness! To identify with the dream's fantasy, with the terms in which it has presented itself, is to miss the significance of the fantasy.

*Structure:* Significant structural relationships exist within and among images. Accordingly, images to some extent depend upon each other for their meaning. But it is important here that we separate ourselves from those schools of thought which would see images as only structures, deriving their meaning entirely from the slots they fill. In some varieties of structural thinking, form and matter, structure and content, can be separated; in imagistic thinking these pairs are one. The wise old man is both an archetypal structure and a content, and even the number four, the *quaternio*, such an abstract structural idea, is an imagistic content appearing as the four persons of my family, or a four-passenger car, or a city block.

Because images with contents are always structurally positioned within a dream, we cannot speak of them apart from this context. A red bird in one dream and a red bird in another never carry exactly the same content, since neither their structural relation (positioning) within the dream nor the other dream images with which they are structurally related are identical.

And the reverse is also true. Because structures are made up of images with contents, we cannot speak of them apart from these contents. Identical dreams with only a single content different—a black bird rather than a red one—would make for different meanings. In other words, it is not the position alone which makes for a symbol's meaning, but both position and content. The red bird is not the result of structural determinants (laws of force, binary oppositions, grammar, linguistics, or whatever) but is itself one of the determinants shaping the dream. The image is itself an irreducible and complete union of form and content, and for us cannot be considered apart from either. Image is both the content of a structure and the structure of a content.

## II. IMPLICATION

*...interpretation must guard against making use of any other viewpoints than those manifestly given by the content itself. If someone dreams of a lion, the correct interpretation can only lie in the direction of the lion; in other words, it will be essentially an*

*amplification of this image. Anything else would be an inadequate and incorrect interpretation, since the image "lion" is a quite unmistakable and sufficiently positive presentation. —CW 17, § 162*

Having set forth the initial aspect of our approach to the dream as image and explored what image is, let's move on to its elaboration, what image implies. This second means of approach has to do with the entire procedure of drawing implications from the original image. Of course the further we move from the actual dream text, the more open to question, to individual differences, biases, and particular areas of knowledge (and their accompanying lacunae) our interpretation becomes. When we speak of this movement from image to implication (and on to a third category which we shall come to later), we aren't speaking of a sequential progression in the act of interpreting. It isn't that we necessarily look first at image, and then draw implications, and so on, in that order. But these are all aspects of interpretation, which order is not sequential but ontological. Image is prior not in time, not because we need take it up first when considering a dream, but prior in the sense of most basic, that to which we return again and again, and that which is the primary ground and spring of our imaginal awareness.

Thus when regarding the dream in its implications, we realize the narrower selectivity within which we are operating. And this seems paradoxical for it feels (because of our greater conceptual development? because of our iconoclastic tradition?) as if the image were the more limited mode. The dream only says this or gives these particular images, while implications seem to extend in many directions. But by moving away from image and into implication we forego the depths of the image—its limitless ambiguities—which can only partly be grasped as implications. So to expand on the dream is also to narrow it—a further reason not to stray too far from the source.

*Narrative:* We have so far treated the dream in relative stasis, sensing the various events of the dream as its levels or weaves. But now we begin to hear and watch the dream in its narrative or dramatic sense. It was to this aspect of the dream that Jung referred when he spoke of its dramatic structure: setting, development, *peripeteia*, *lysis* (CW 8, 561ff.).

Since most dreams appear in this story form, we might follow Jung here and use narrative rather than image as the primary category.

But this brings us into new entanglements, the first of which is the verbal nature of narrative. Even though words contain images, words cannot altogether contain them: words and images are not identical. Since for us images are primary, then any form into which the image is cast is a transposition of it, perhaps a step away from it. Of course, putting an image into words can vivify and enhance it; yet at the same time this move burdens and informs images with all the problems of language. Language has now become the context, a context which demands its kind of coherence. We have all had the experience of struggling to write down in coherent form what seems an essentially incoherent dream. But I am beginning to question our idea of coherence. Is it truly the dream that is incoherent or does our verbal approach make it so? Images do not require words to disclose their inherent sense, but as soon as we are involved with language, then what would inhere in the image is transposed into verbal coherence. So we find that some dreams cannot be written down. They resist the transposition, and then we find them "incoherent." We can't put the images together into a story.

So the second difficulty with narrative is that its verbal nature requires a coherence of a special sort: story or a sense of sequence. One thing occurs before another and leads to another. But the sequence of dream fragments is often ambiguous—and from the point of view of the image this must be so, for the image has no before and after. Through our telling, dream fragments whose sequence is ambiguous tend to become one thing rather than another. Our narrating gives an irreversible direction and forms the dream into a definite pattern.

Noting narrative's limitations is not to question the power of the word, the logos, in therapy—indeed the way we tell our story is the way we form our therapy—but merely to keep narrative distinct from the more primary imaginal layering and to note their sometimes discrepant phenomenology. When verbal or narrative lapses occur in our dream-telling, we fill in, we elaborate with what would make sense for narrative meaning but not necessarily for imagistic meaning. Images are entirely reversible; they have no fixed order or sequence. In some cases these narrative interpolations distort or even betray the image, since they tend to collapse it into the narrative, into the story we tell about it. And if dreams are primarily images—the Greek word for dream, *oneiros*, meant image not story—then putting these

images into a narrative is like looking at a painting and making a story of it. This sense of narration is also reinforced by therapy. As we tell our dreams, so we narrate our life stories. Not only the content of our dreams is influenced by analysis but also the very style of our remembering. Analysis tends to emphasize the narrative rather than the imagistic, even if Jung's emphasis on painting and sculpting has helped restore primacy to the image. But our real concern here is not whether imagistic or narrative report is the more basic. Rather our thought is that since the narrative style of description is inextricably bound with a sense of continuity—what in psychotherapy we call the ego—misuse of continuity because of the ego is also close at hand.

This brings us to the third and most important difficulty of narrative: it tends to become the ego's trip. The hero has a way of finding himself in the midst of any story. He can turn anything into a parable of a way to make it and stay on top. The continuity in a story becomes his ongoing heroic movement. Hence when we read a dream as narrative there is nothing more ego-natural than to take the sequence of movement as a progression culminating in the dreamer's just reward or defeat. The way story encapsulates one into it as protagonist corrupts the dream into a mirror in which the ego sees only its concerns. And since its main concern is progress in terms of whatever value system it has, dream interpretation soon becomes part of the heroic progress. Dreamer and interpreter chop their way through the unconscious—deciding here, refusing there—because the sequence of events has fallen prey to the idea of progressive betterment. Before and after have come also to mean worse and better.

The problem is compounded, since both the dreamer as he appears in the dream and the interpreter's heroic tendencies may appear in more subtle guises than the obvious one of heroic competence. Both may be heroic in function even though they be feeling and submissive. As Hercules dressed in feminine attire at one point, so too may heroic consciousness. But under this submissiveness, ego remains the center of the dream or therapeutic story. The dream is about him, his individuation.

Perhaps what we're really speaking of as heroic ego consciousness is less one or another mythological figure and more that mode which severs the inherent continuity and intraconnection of the dream image as a whole. This mode continuously makes divisions between

good and bad, friends and enemies, positive and negative, in accord with how well these figures and events comply with our notions of progression. Then to interpret as "negative" or "positive" these same characters is to take the narrative at face value, thereby getting caught in the dream ego's idea of movement.

As the failing is a rather obvious one, analytical sophistication has taught us to make one of two contrary moves. We may, for instance, side with the bad guys, taking the viewpoint of the "unconscious" (the forces opposed to the dream ego). Or we may attempt to distance ourselves from the narrative altogether by judging it. We show how the dream situation might have been more adroitly handled, where the ego took a false turn or set up a self-destructive situation. We become coaches, judging performance. But by so judging, we are perhaps even more trapped by the narrative and its ego-emphasis, since this trap is more subtle. Our interpretive remarks about better ways of handling are statements of one heroic and more experienced consciousness (ours) against another (that of the dreamer, who has now been identified with his performance in the dream). We are simply urging him to swap his heroic myth for ours or polish it in terms of ours.

Because the ego bind occasioned by narrative is on some level perhaps inevitable, before going any further we had best pay narrative some of the respect due it. We cannot hear a story without being caught; we cannot tell a tale without feeling ourselves into some part. Narrative, a most profound mode of archetypal experience, catches us up emotionally and imaginatively. Whether or not we would go so far as to maintain, as some do (vide Stephen Crites), that without narrative there would be no experience at all, we can at least agree that tales change experience and enrich daily patterns with archetypal significance. Personal events, moods, jealousies, and even symptoms, when reflected through a story, gain weight and yet distance. Single-sighted life patterns become multidimensional, and the variations brought by the narrative all become part of experience.

But just the reverse is also true when I take, as some part of me always does, the narrative too egoistically, too personally. In this case I become inflated with the archetypal nature of the material, and the material diminishes to fit my ego needs. There is indeed a regressive aspect to poesis, a means by which I may merely reinforce my own myopia, may fail to see the fantasy in its far-ranging, autonomous

aspect, as not just "mine." When I see it in its archetypal magnitude, judgments fall away. There is no way I can say this character is a good person, this a bad one, this figure made the wrong move, or see how unconscious he was. Characters are unconscious. Given the arrangement, they all do what they have to do, and given the characters the situation has to be as it is.

Finally, the way we treat narrative is the way we treat our own psyches. To hear the dream story as a moral allegory with a message for right and wrong behavior (progressive, regressive) is to sit in judgment on our souls. When we view the tale as archetypal, however, the characters all become valuable subjective entities, both lesser (only a piece of, not an identity) and greater (with more archetypal resonance) than any of our particular, narrow, and ego-concerned viewpoints.

*Amplification:* One way we draw upon narrative in analysis is through amplification. Amplifying a dream means an attempt through cultural analogues to make it louder and larger. At first glance it may seem this process mainly calls for a general background of cultural knowledge and some bit of intuition and luck. On closer examination, however, we find the process to be more selective and coherent.

When we ask ourselves what we have done in an amplification, we find first of all similarities. A dream figure or theme is in some essential way similar to a mythical figure or theme. The comparison we have made moves us from a personal image to one that is collective and cultural; we have moved from a lesser to a greater, from something fairly known (in the sense of close at hand) to something rather unknown (far-reaching). The key seems to be this quality of essential similarity. Whereas a similarity that is merely coincidental would take us very far astray—*viz.* the reams of amplification sometimes used to the detriment of the actual dream—a similarity of essence would of necessity remain in touch with the dream image, which relationship would be expressed in simile ("like" or "as") in order to parallel rather than replace the actual dream image.

*Elaboration:* Dreams are like knots of condensed implications, which we elaborate by taking key words whose connotations we explicate by treating the words as images. Going westward in a dream becomes going toward freedom, the new, death, sunset, natura, clockwise, extroversion... When the dreamer elaborates, or gives associations, there is always the danger of overvaluing them, of

letting them be determinate. We tend to forget that his remarks are probably from the conscious point of view; i.e., they are ego-syntonic, which does not mean they are invalid but that they are limited.

In most cases, the dreamer's elaboration tells us more about the dreamer than it does about the dream. We learn from this elaboration the ego's positioning and the constructs through which it views itself. Let say friend John appears in the text, for whom the dreamer gives the associative attributes of laziness, trickiness, and lack of determination. From this we may assume that the ego's ideal is non-lazy, non-tricky, and determined. But far more importantly, we learn that the dreamer sees in terms of these constructs. They say little about the dream, since they are after all conscious elaborations, but tell us a great deal about the ego's relation to the content "friend-John."

An over-solicitousness to the associative material may lead us to an additional difficulty in that we may lose to the conscious viewpoint the subtleties of a dream figure. Then we lose the chance to dissolve a conscious fixity, expressed by the association, and instead further rigidify it. The ego and "friend-John" become all the more firmly entrenched in the positions they have determined for themselves and each other.

*Repetition:* This is another characteristic which draws our attention when hearing or reading a dream and from which we draw implications. By repetitions I mean similarities of all and any sort. In the same dream we may find repetitions of adjectives—several things called "great" or "green"; or of verbs—running, rushing, hurrying; or of similarities in shape—a round tire, a round clock face; and so forth. Or the dream may show the recurrence of a theme, e.g., lower to higher. Let's say in the dream we find the secretary has no time and one must speak to the boss, a pain in the knee has become now a headache, someone is promoted in school. The collection of these repetitions shows a theme (movement upward) within the dream. This movement cannot be questioned—we can't say it should not appear—without betraying the image level of the dream. The most we can do, and it is a great deal, is to point up the repetition and its coordinates: boss, headache, academic promotion. All have to do with an archetypal idea of higher, and each carries the benefits and detriments of the others.

*Restatement:* The surest way of keeping implications close to the image is by restating the dream and its phrases, giving them a new inflection. By restatement I mean a metaphorical nuance, echoing or reflecting the text beyond its literal statement. This might be done in two ways: first, by replacing the actual word with synonyms and equivalents. (*Cf.* above under *Elaboration* where the movement westward becomes the movement toward freedom, death, etc.) Second, by simply restating in the same words but emphasizing the metaphorical quality within the words themselves. "I'm driving" in the literal sense becomes "I'm driving" or "I'm driving," depending on which metaphorical sense we stress. Without restatement we tend to get caught in the dream at its face value and draw easy conclusions from it, never truly entering into the psyche or the dream. When we are completely stumped with a dream, there might be nothing better to do than to replay it, let it sound again, listening until it breaks through into a new key.

### III. SUPPOSITION

*Nowhere do prejudices, misinterpretations, value judgments, idiosyncrasies, and projections trot themselves out more glibly and unashamedly than in this particular field of research, regardless of whether one is observing oneself or one's neighbour. Nowhere does the observer interfere more drastically with the experiment than in psychology.*  
—CW 17, § 160

So far we have spoken of our interpretation in terms of the actual dream text (Image) and the Implications that can be drawn from it. Now we consider a third category, Supposition, which is most removed from the actual dream text and consequently most open to the personal predilections, opinions, and intuitions of the individual analyst. Under Supposition we might place any statement of causality, any because of this-that interpretive move; likewise any generalization made on the basis of the dream, any evaluation, prognosis, any use of past or future tense (this will be or this was), as well as any literal advice concerning the analysand's life situation.

Just as in the image all descriptive attributes are interwoven and form a single context, and as our discussion of implication centered in viewing the dream as narrative—so suppositions stem from and involve a single attitude. This attitude feels itself most obliged to

have an effect upon the analysand, to give him something, anything at this point, to take home with him. And curiously enough, it seems that the more the other two methods have failed, i.e., the more we have failed in our imaginative response to the dream—the more insistent our sense that now we must really make the connection. Unfortunately our failure with image and implication has probably been due to our own lapses of psyche, our own loss of imaginal reality and sense of soul. And when this occurs, as it seems to so inevitably, our first move toward reclaiming soul is to project it everywhere else and then to demand its reality. When the delicate movement of metaphor is lost, we tend to call in stronger, more literal replacements.

Now it seems as though the dream can be made actually relevant only by connecting it with a more simplistic notion of reality, a move made at the cost of the image, whose imaginal reality we can no longer sense. We have lost our touchstone of image as psyche and psyche as image and our premise that nothing can be more relevant or real than the dream image itself. Desperately we attempt to connect the dream to the collective fantasy of a reality we call life, relationships, the workaday world. But curiously enough this move often becomes a move into magic. For by losing the true power of the image, we borrow power instead from a magical connection with the ego-construed world of *materia*. By magic I here mean: reading the impersonal aspects of the world in terms of my personal intentions and interests (employing dreams for prognosis, diagnosis, foretellings, secret connections...). One modern form of magical thinking is causal thinking.

*Causality:* The dream as Image makes no causal statements. Events occur in relation to each other but these events are connective, as in painting or sculpture, without being causal. When we make causal statements in our interpretations, as useful as this may be at times, we are no longer talking about the imagination from the imagination but rather from a set of physical suppositions. How we do this makes a difference in our interpretation. In the dream fragment "I'm in a room with Mr. X and suddenly the lights go out" we might say:

a) Mr. X causes the lights to go out. (In rough analytic terms this would be to say that my shadow X—and all the qualities he carries—

causes unconsciousness. So saying, we would then proceed to focus mainly on the agent, shadow X.)

b) Or, X is the result of the lights having gone out. (In this case unconsciousness is a precondition for the appearance of X, and thus we will direct our attention to the unconscious state as agent.)

Let's take another example: "My fiancé and I are riding in the mountains in a horse-drawn sleigh. We pull up in front of my mother's house. She sees us and then slams the door so that the horses panic and drag us down a hill at a terrifying pace." The most apparent causal statement here is the one given by the dream ego—the mother's door-slamming causes the horses to panic. But to take this as the basis for the dream's interpretation is to ignore the total image. My fiancé and I sleighing over the mountain snow could just as well be seen as the cause of my mother's doorslamming or the cause of the horses' panic and downward pull. If we give equal recognition to each aspect of the dream, we realize that all events affect and simultaneously constellate each other. So analytically it is the total situation we must insight, not one or another aspect which taken causally would tend to exclude the rest. Perhaps this is the real danger of causal thinking, and why Jung warned of it. When anything is given priority as mover, all others become subsidiary, mere aspects with no more intentionality of their own than billiard balls. Purpose then is imputed only to the initial cause (or causes), and the rest falls into a state without anima, without movement or intentionality.

*Evaluation:* This refers to any negative/positive statement, any value judgment, applied to a dream or to any part of it. On the image level evaluations cannot apply, for the image simply is. My mother sticking needles in me is neither positive nor negative; it simply is. In Implication, however, with its narrative emphasis, characters take on some quality of—if not good or bad—at least helping or hindering. My mother is hindering me, the protagonist. But this is only because I have the idea of myself as protagonist and therefore require others to position themselves as helping or hindering. Any evaluative idea about my mother's needling behavior—she is a negative character or it is all for my own good—is pure supposition. In our initial dream with the seven interpretive examples, we might likewise suppose that it is good that the dreamer lies down, or it is mere passivity, or that the unknown man is like an intellectualization leading her up and

astray, or like a positive animus leading her into the unknown regions of her psyche. Which of these we suppose reflects our specific projections upon the dream or our ideas about such things in general.

*Generalization:* A dream is a specific statement of a particular constellation of characters and settings, so that any attempt to generalize from it is to suppose. Much of what we do in psychology has to do with generalization. We see a specific occurrence or fact and immediately try to give it a general significance, fit it into some larger framework. On the basis of a single dream we tend to say that the dreamer is this or that kind of person or has this or that problem. We make a "working" identity. Generalizations are extremely useful as long as we see that they are merely more or less clever suppositions. But much of what we gain through them we can also accomplish by means of amplification. By amplifying we call up parallels, patterns of significance. In amplification, however, the particular is not lost sight of, is not swallowed by the general, but played alongside, as a second melody in the same key. Particular dream motifs may easily parallel mythic ones without being subsumed by them. *Specification:* Rather connected to generalization is what would seem an opposite. Instead of broadening the dream context, specification refers to its narrowing for specific application. The dream is focused on one or another concern of the dreamer. We say "this dream has to do with the analysis, or your relation to your father, job, marriage..."—the innuendo being what the dreamer should do in regard to these matters and that the dream is giving indications. Indeed we talk about the dream as though it were a theological entity: knowing like an omniscient God, caring like a New Testament God, creating like an Old Testament God, and yet thinking just like you and me. The dream is concerned with all the petty things we are concerned with—where to go, what to do—and then corrects us when we have done the wrong things or made the wrong decisions. Specifying the dream into a message both anthropomorphizes the dream and divinizes it. Whether this be seen as a secularization of the religious instinct, a displacement, or a new wellspring of meaning is entirely up to our theological biases. But whatever stand we take to this theological issue, one thing remains psychologically certain: all specific conclusions we make are in the realm of supposition. The dream doesn't give specific advice; we do, leaning upon the dream for support.

\* \* \*

When we look back over these suppositions we find most of what we actually do in therapy falls within this category. We might suppose therefore that dream analysis is highly personal, so much so that interpretations tell more about the interpreter than about the material under scrutiny. And indeed this is so, as we know from the seven different interpretations with which we started. If dream interpretation is so subjective, we might wonder how it works at all.

Just here is the catch—because it does work. What makes it work must be based on something other than the dream image and its implications. Since the relationship between the dream image and our suppositions is so tenuous, we're no longer in a position to claim our interpretations are based on the dream. Their validity must derive from another source, which I suppose we can call therapeutic skill.

Does this mean we have made full circle from our starting point, only to return to the pragmatism with which we began and from which we have tried to escape? If our interpretations are mainly suppositions, and these are successful by virtue of therapeutic skill, then perhaps we must back up our practical ability with a theory of therapy distinct from, i.e., no longer disguised as, a theory of dreams. We have made a start in that direction by attempting to recognize and distinguish among our moves in regard to dreams.

When we look back we may also wonder why so much of what we do with dreams is supposition. Despite the internal richness of the dream image, or perhaps just because of it, we seem to give least attention to this category. Could it be we suppose because we cannot imagine? The dream confounds us with the power of its images, and we are mostly at a loss to respond with an equivalent power. Our imaginations are untrained, and we have no adequate epistemology of the imagination with which to meet the dream image on its own level.

Analytical training teaches us primarily how to suppose about dreams and how to work out their implications. We learn by imitating the suppositions of our analysts about our own dreams. What we don't learn is a psychology of the image, comparable to what students of archeology, iconography, aesthetics, or textual criticism would learn about the image in their fields. But we can't even begin to discover what would be a psychology of the image so long as we in psychology

are exploiting the image for what we take to be our therapeutic aims. Perhaps the other way round would be more appropriate: discover what the image wants and from that determine our therapy.

But training the imagination and developing an epistemology of it are full of hazards. On the one hand, we have to recognize our historical stuntedness in regard to the imagination, so that when we begin imagining in response to images of dream, literature, or elsewhere, we are not surprised at the impoverishment and the subjectivity of our responses. On the other hand, as if to compensate the iconoclasm of our tradition, there is an undifferentiated glorification of images, which leads neither to precision nor to a psychological connection. Perhaps the only way through these two limiting alternatives is a *via negativa*, a psychology of the image proceeding from a recognition of unsuitable moves. In this paper we have attempted such an approach. Our aim has been to work out a method for interpretive self-awareness, thus to clear some of the confusion from the primary images of the psyche—those that come in dreams. By reflecting upon our interpretive moves *vis-à-vis* dreams, we may gain some differentiation by realizing when we are not giving due to the imaginal.