

CHAPTER 1



Theorizing Dreaming and the Self

JEANNETTE MARIE MAGEO

I am accustomed to sleep and in my dreams to imagine the same things that lunatics imagine when awake, or sometimes things which are even less plausible. . . . I realize so clearly that there are no conclusive indications by which waking life can be distinguished from sleep that I am quite astonished, and my bewilderment is such that it is almost able to convince me that I am sleeping.

—Descartes, *First Meditation*

*T*n Western intellectual history, René Descartes is the prototypical proponent of the model of the person as the “I” who is identical with his reasoning capacity—a capacity carefully disarticulated from affect and embodiment. Descartes begins his first meditation with a reflection on the dream. The evidence that experience is real in dreams, Descartes insists, comes from the senses ([1637] 1952, 76–77). There the senses give false testimony about the physical situation of the dreamer and misreport on the world. This serves for Descartes as reason enough to retreat into a logic denuded of rather than enriched by other elements of the self. In retreating from these elements, Descartes must retreat from the dream. Indeed, he

poses it as his counterexample, recognizing the dream inevitably implies a more complex geography of the self and of the experienced world than can be inferred from conscious life. In this volume we seek a model of the self that includes embodiment and affect, as well as reflecting culturally and historically variable dimensions of being a person. We seek this inclusive model at the site of the original repudiation of embodiment and affect in Western thought—the dream.

I begin with a brief overview of the history of dream studies in anthropology. I then ask how one might reconceptualize the self from the perspective of the dream and contextualize the volume's chapters in relation to this question. This chapter also provides commentary on those to follow, relating them to the theme of the volume and offering critical reflections.

The Dream in Anthropology

Some early anthropologists tended to view dreams as a venue for the creation of culture. Tylor (1873), for example, believed that religions arose as a kind of dream interpretation—that is, as attempts to account for the events of dream life, which were looked upon as real experience. Lincoln (1935, 189) distinguished between ordinary dreams and “cultural pattern dreams.” From the latter, he believed, people took inspiration for religious cults, but also for rituals and the arts. Influenced by psychoanalysis, other early anthropologists tended to see dreams as involving “only a minor reworking of already existing [cultural] material” (D’Andrade 1961, 298–99) and as a stage for the symbolic dramatization of universal psychological problems and cultural defense mechanisms. Rather than being mutually incompatible, a number of the authors in this volume propose that dreams are a venue in which people recreate culture precisely because the “psychological problematics” that people share in a culture are central to dreams. By this phrase, I mean that cultural psychologies are always to a degree problematic. People strive to organize and resolve recurrent but variable human problems (like incestuous feelings, sibling rivalries, identity, death, and so forth), but succeed only in partial ways. These ways are distinctly cultural and leave people with painful affective and embodied experiences with which they must struggle and out of which they continue to change their cultures.

More narrowly, many early-twentieth-century anthropological dream studies were influenced by two psychoanalytic tenets.¹ First, there were certain symbols that had a universal meaning, usually of a sexual nature. Second, dreams had a two-tiered structure. The surface stratum was the *manifest content*, which might be culturally variant; the deep stratum was the *latent con-*

tent, which was universally the same (Kluckhohn and Morgan 1951, 120). In psychoanalytic theory, the manifest content was the dream as dreamt and was borrowed from the shifting images and occurrences of daily life. It was the remains of the day—"day residues," Freud called them (1963, 83–135, 213–177). These remains were enlisted to represent anxiety, guilt, and desires that were linked to the complexes of early childhood. These feelings were likely to be disguised in the manifest dream, for example through displacement (sign substitutions), condensation (sign combinations), or symbolization (multifarious use of a single sign). The disguise was necessary, according to Freud, because dreams operated to maintain sleep; desires could disturb it because they incited action toward satisfaction and anxiety. Desires might also incite anxiety and guilt because they were often in conflict with social mores or with the individual's self-esteem. Just as the senses conveyed only illusions in Descartes's view of the dream, the manifest content was a ruse in Freud's view: its deformations and bizarre combinations were distractions from the dream's real meaning.

The mid-twentieth century saw the formation of the Culture and Personality school in anthropology. Revolving around figures such as Margaret Mead and Ruth Benedict, this school was interested in a range of personality theories and in how ethnography might contribute to and critique psychological theory. Mead's *Sex and Temperament in Three Primitive Societies* (1963), for example, spun off of Jung's idea of psychological types (1963; 1972b, 217). Mead's *Coming of Age in Samoa*, ([1928] 1961) on the other hand, was both informed by and aimed as a critique of Freudian theory.² I have argued elsewhere (2001a) that through her ethnographic work Mead was forging a "critical cultural relativism"—an anthropology that combined comparative psychological theory with critical theory.

The Culture and Personality thinker who made the most significant contribution to dream studies was Dorothy Eggan.³ She, like Mead, saw her work on dreams as "a challenge to the social sciences" (1949, 469). I review several of what I regard as her major ideas about dreams here both because of their importance in shaping anthropological studies of the dream that followed and because these ideas are directly linked to many of the themes of this volume.

Like Mead, Eggan began by using ethnography, specifically her studies of the Hopi, to critique Freudian theory and its usage in anthropology. Eggan criticized the "oversimplified procedure" of dream analysis that had been employed by psychoanalytic anthropologists who often made "equation-like interpretations of dreams" (1952, 473). In this endeavor, she quoted Freud to the effect that dreams "possess many and varied meanings; so that, as in Chinese script, only the context can furnish the correct mean-

ing” (1952, 474). For Eggan, of course, the context was a culture, or more precisely an interrelational setting within a culture (1952, 474)—an insight echoed in Vincent Crapanzano’s afterward (chapter 10).

Freud used free association to analyze the dream ([1900]1953). For Eggan, “dreams in themselves are a form of projective phenomenon and represent a process of free association, both in sleep and after awakening” (1949, 197). The dream report, then, by continuing the projective processes of the dream itself, embeds dreams ever further in cultural modes of narration and cultural meaning systems. The manifest dream was composed of “culturally derived symbols” (Eggan 1949, 179). Variant cultural experiences would lead dreamers to symbolize events quite differently and this might lead to differences in cultural symbol systems (Eggan 1952, 479–480). Eggan’s interest in dreams anticipates the turn in anthropology toward a concern with cultures as meaning systems that became salient through the work of Lévi-Strauss.

Eggan tells us that the dream is a “released image energy” that creates “a new inner world” (1952, 469). Similarly, several authors herein argue that dreams speak a different language than the conscious mind—the language of the imagination—and investigate the nature of that language as it bears upon dreaming and the self. Eggan believed that what transpires in dream narratives themselves “affords a deeper understanding of culturally conditioned affects, particularly as regards the disharmony between the cultural ideal” and what people actually experience in a culture (1952, 478). She saw the dream narrative as particularly useful in understanding culture change because of a “distinct lag” between people’s consciously held models of culture and their actual historical circumstances (1952, 478–79). Chapters 2, 3, 4, and 5 also argue that dreams are continually forging symbolic bridges between these two.

According to Eggan, during the first half of the twentieth century “the concept of culture” had been “intentionally restricted to exclude material pertaining to the individual as such” (1952, 469). In more contemporary terminology, Eggan believed that dreams were a way toward person-centered ethnography and potentially offered insight as to the relation between culture and subjectivity. Dreams allowed informants to talk about themselves in what they assumed to be a “safely cryptic manner,” which was nonetheless revealing of intense concerns and feelings they might not otherwise be willing to share with an itinerant anthropologist (1952, 477–78). Hopi “tend to work out a personal delineation of their problems at the manifest level in dreams in surprisingly complete and honest detail” and these problems “are of more than passing concern to the individual” (Eggan 1949, 179–80). Anticipating Hall and Van de Castle’s method of content analysis (1966), Eggan held that people had a “pattern of dreaming” that was uniquely their own and that dream series evinced themes that were seldom finished in one dream (1949, 180).

By the mid-1970s, inspired by Geertz's brilliant explorations of personhood and culture, anthropologists turned toward "local knowledge"—studying folk theories in culture as alternative knowledge systems.⁴ Local ways of dreaming, of narrating dreams, and of interpreting them became examples, both as forms of ethnopsychiatry and, more broadly, as alternative knowledge systems. This tack on dreaming and culture was wonderfully developed and illustrated in Tedlock's collection on dreaming (1987). As anthropologists studied dreams as local knowledge, they became increasingly aware of the part dreams played in communicative processes in culture and as a social performance, of either a ritual or an informal nature.⁵ The essays in this volume share a commitment to perspectives on the dream grounded in long-term ethnography and a belief in the necessity of seeing culture from the local point of view.

The renewed emphasis on cultural relativism manifest in studying local ways of knowing was significant in cracking open Western universalistic paradigms in preference for studying cultures as unique cases—unique instances of being human. Along with this emphasis, however, came a hesitancy among some researchers to read dreams as indicative of cultural psychology, particularly as indicative of psychological problems in cultures, which tended to be seen as disrespectful. But all cultures, I argue above, have psychological problematics; to suggest that these problematics exist is not to presume inferiority, but rather a dynamic and vital element in culture, which must be considered in person-centered ethnography. The present volume considers psychological problematics and how studying cultures can provide anthropologists and others with new perspectives on dreaming and the self.

Theories of the Self and Dreams

As in prior work (1995, 1998, 2002a), here I take *self* to be a domain term that refers to all aspects of being a person. Identity, on the other hand, is the cumulative result of affirming "That is me" and "That is not me"; it develops through acts of identification and disidentification with elements of internal experience and with persons, groups, and representations in the cultural world (Mageo 2001b; Mageo and Knauft 2002). Inasmuch as identity is that sense of self that derives from successive acts of identification, it is fluid and ever in transformation, and the transformations are effected in part, many of the authors in this volume argue, in dreams. Recent anthropological insights about spirit possession (Boddy 1989; Lambek 1981, 1996; Mageo 1996a)—that it is a venue in which to think through waking experience of a cultural and historical nature—can also be applied to the dream. Dreams progressively work through our experience as cultural beings and as

such contribute, however subtly, to how people construct identity in daily cultural life.

How does dreaming, cross-culturally considered, reflect on prior theories of the self? Take, for example, George Herbert Mead's (1934) idea that the self is composed of an "I" and a "me." Mead's "I" is the individual who feels, desires, wills, and acts. The "me" is the presence of social others within the self. The "me" endlessly offers its opinion about the "I" and dialogues with it. Who, then, is the self that acts in dreams? Is it the "I"? Are all other dream figures the "me"? This seems likely from L. S. Vygotsky's viewpoint. For Vygotsky, the child's internal life is an introjection of its social life: "Every function in the child's development appears twice . . . first, between people . . . and then inside the child" (1978, 57). The people we meet in dreams would then be doubles or combinations of those we have related to first in social life (some remembered, some forgotten in surface consciousness). It is unlikely, however, that dream figures are all actual people (although they have relations to actual people); they are also the characters who populate the world of stories in which we develop (Mageo 2002c). This world of stories is interiorized in childhood, just as are social relations, and establishes the fundaments of our imaginations and our dreams (Mageo 1998, 76–79; Miller, Fury, and Mintz 1996).

If Mead's concept of the "me" recognizes the presence of society in the constitution of the self, it nonetheless locates that self within—in internal events like feeling and thinking and in internal dialogues, rather than in social transactions. Similarly, in Western cultures we place the dream within a person's head. Many of the peoples who anthropologists study, however, see dreams as an alternative social world, as much outside the person as a convivial party, even if what goes on there is often far from convivial. For them, dreams are the gate to a sphere inhabited, like our own, by powers and people with which and with whom they live and cope—as is the dream world for Erika Bourguignon's Haitians (chapter 7). These peoples also locate the self in social role-playing rather than inside the person.

In Samoa, for example, *agāga* refers to the constitutive self believed to survive death and to travel in dreams.⁶ *Agāga*, however, is a doubling of the word *aga*, which means "persona" (Mageo 1998, 10). A persona is a face we show to others. Deriving from the masks of Roman theater, this word also refers to the role that goes with a particular mask. Like Samoans, the Quiché Maya have a concept of the constitutive self as a non-corporal being that inhabits the body at birth and leaves in dreams or visions and at death. This self is said to be one of twenty possible "faces" (Tedlock 1987, 110, 115; cf. Mauss 1990, 39).

The divergence reflected by variant folk models of the self was much discussed in late-twentieth-century anthropology and cross-cultural psychol-

ogy. Folk models of the person as a context-transcendent individual have been called egocentric; folk models of the person as an ensemble of social roles or personae have been called sociocentric.⁷ These terms represent hypothetical extremes—north and south poles of a map where the ground is always to one degree or another intermediate and more complex than any map can show.

Carl Jung mapped the self in a manner that at first glance resembles more sociocentric folk models—that is, as multiple (1963). For Jung, at birth people were a vast sea of potentiality. The work of the first half of life was to make portions of that potentiality into an actual self (Jung 1971). This was accomplished by cultivating stronger aspects of self at the expense of others—splitting off aspects less well favored by temperament, society, or family relations and coming to regard them as “not me.”⁸ Jung (1963, 8–22; 1967, 29–38) believed that we often construct our vision of others by projecting onto them unacceptable aspects of the self. Men split off an anima and women an animus, for example, when forming their gender identity. Despite disidentification, these “archetypes” remained important aspects of the self, although they operated independently of consciousness. Similarly, current constructionist theories suggest that the self is a complex system, composed of conscious subsystems that are integrated to a degree, but also of less conscious subsystems that “may or may not remain separate from other parts of self-organization and function relatively . . . autonomously” (Hollan 2000, 539). Jung (1968, 3–41) and Perls after him (1971), thought that we encountered these parts in dreams.⁹

At critical life junctures one might meet what Jung called “the Self” in dreams, by which he meant the reintegration of all these potentials, in the form of an elevated or semidivine personage, such as a king or Christ (1963, 25–71, 184–221; 1970a, 110–28, 343–55, 497–505). Thus, in classic Euro-American theories, even multiple views of the self tend to privilege a unitary self—or at least a self that is striving to be unitary. Many ethnographers and cross-cultural psychologists have critiqued this model of the self and demonstrated that it is by no means universally prominent.¹⁰ Katherine Ewing (1990) argues that the belief that the self is whole is a fiction people invent and reinvent to represent themselves in the ever changing circumstances of their lives. Ewing shows that often these “wholes” include admired parts of others whom the person has encountered in social life.

We meet these evanescent holistic selves in dreams, I suggest, as figures that are condensations of several people we have known in life or in fiction. As in Bakhtin’s idea of heteroglossia (1981), in dreams the self has multiple voices. These voices are those of people appropriated from waking life, who represent our own subself fragments. The dream is the self as other(s), with whom we seldom have unproblematic relationships. Here the

presence of alterity in subjectivity is exposed. Dreams continually splice self with other, complicating “me”/“not me” recognitions. Dream characters are composites of people we know or have known in life and in tales, but also our feelings/thoughts in other guises and those of others about us that we have interiorized. In this regard, dream symbols are at once about the subject and the social world; everything in them has both allegiances.

The self, then, is much larger than its conscious identifications; dreaming provides insight into the congeries of identities that it encompasses. Combining Vygotsky’s and Jung’s ideas, one might view the self as involving a continuing process of incorporating others to make an identity. In dreams this identity is then splintered into part selves who derive from these others and who carry our emotional reactions to them. Upon waking, the part selves we meet in dreams are projected back onto others, who later enter our dreams re-presenting our own feelings for us—and so on ad infinitum.

Part 2: Revisioning the Self and Dreams

Cultural psychologists and psychological anthropologists have long been interested in how the dream’s manifest content reflects cultural and subcultural differences. Cross-cultural psychologists investigated dreams quantitatively through Calvin Hall’s and Robert Van de Castle’s system of content analysis (Domhoff 1996, 99–129). By and large, anthropologists investigated the manifest dream through qualitative and in-depth ethnographic studies that considered variability in belief systems and narrative practices surrounding dreaming in a culture.¹¹ In “Diasporic Dreaming, Identity, and Self-Constitution” (chapter 3), Katherine Ewing, like Eggan before her, begins to deconstruct the idea that dreams’ important symbolic work occurs only on a latent or hidden level. Ewing argues that the dream narrative itself updates culture. As an example, she discusses the dream of the Seneca prophet Handsome Lake. Handsome Lake was instructed in dreams to change the matrilineal transmission of political office and status in his society into a patrilineal system so that it would better articulate with the Euro-American world in which the Seneca had come to live.

Dream narratives, Ewing believes, can be understood as offering analyses of a present social situation in the language of metaphor. Many peoples that anthropologists study believe in the predictive values of dreams. Just like any other good hypothesis, Ewing tells us, a good dream may have predictive value. There are forward looking and problem-solving dreams, as Jung argued. Not all dreams are merely iterative of unresolved childhood conflicts, but are efforts to reposition the self in the social world and to constitute identities by fitting new experiences into existing narratives of self. Ewing

illustrates this point through a dream of a Sufi teacher in Pakistan who lived for some time in England. In the dream, a Sufi saint feeds the dreamer spiritual food in an English basement. Ewing points out that basement apartments are typically where the economically disadvantaged live in England. The dream relates the man's current elevated religious identity with his dys tonic identity experiences as a migrant. Transnational cultures are characterized by hybridity. Transnational dreams offer insight into how people are psychologically affected by and synthesize cultural incongruities.

For Douglas Hollan, the reconfiguration of the self in dreams stems from an articulation of existing self schemas with daily experience (chapter 4). These articulations take place in "selfscape dreams." These dreams are the "nightly news" of the self—registering within us the current state of our personhood, our body, and our relations with others. Selfscape dreams are universal, Hollan believes, but their content varies from person to person and culture to culture. Illustrating this cross-cultural recurrence and variability, Hollan discusses his ethnographic work with dreams among the Toraja of Sulawesi and his psychoanalytic work in Los Angeles.

In Sulawesi we meet Grandfather Limbong, a Toraja elder politically influential in his time, but suffering declining health and fortunes. Limbong dreams of his stomach emerging from his mouth, which he likens to dividing meat at community feasts and to being divided like meat at a feast and distributed. Hollan sees these dreams as articulating revolutions in Limbong's body and social standing with his identity.

In Los Angeles we meet Steve, a forty-year-old high tech specialist who is emotionally dependent upon and psychologically crippled by his parents. In dreams, often a parent is driving or back-seat-driving Steve's car and the car is impeded or damaged. The car, Hollan suggests, is an image of freedom/mobility in American society and represents Steve's identity in dreams. I suspect the car represents not only physical mobility, but social mobility: cars display socioeconomic identity, particularly for men, as one advertisement after another attests. The car is also the phallus in a Lacanian sense: it is a detachable symbol of masculine identity and privilege that can be lost by men or appropriated by women. Steve's relations with his parents may not only have impeded his freedom/mobility, but also compromised his gender identity. I wonder, are selfscape dreams aimed at charting a course out of an oppressive sense of self, of embodiment, of others, and of the world?

Limbong's dreams, Hollan concludes, show that the demands and expectations of others can be experienced as annihilating the self even in a culture that valorizes sociality, like the Toraja. Steve's dreams show that, even in a society that valorizes independence, internal representations of significant others can be destructively interfused with self. Hollan's selfscape dreams intimate modes of being outside these two cultural worlds and reflect

upon them critically. Limbong's dream caricatures sociocentrism as cannibalism. Steve's dream places the putatively exhilarating freedom/mobility attributed to cars in late-capitalist American society (or more precisely to owning them), as well as to white males who usually drive them in advertisements, in quotation marks. Here cars are like the oozingly fluid clocks in Dali, betraying the seemingly reliable cultural order they represent. For Limbong and Steve alike, dreams are a key venue for the life of the self, and the dreaming self appears as an essential counterpart to the waking self.

In "Race, Postcoloniality, and Identity in Samoan Dreams" (chapter 5), I explore imaginal processing in dreams through consideration of a powerful public symbol—skin color. Imaginal processing is aptly characterized, I argue, by Derrida's concept of *differance* (1982). Derrida's idea is that symbol systems operate via a continual slippage of meaning. Hegemonic colonial worlds attempt to halt this slippage because they are built upon fixed meanings ascribed differentially to advantaged and disadvantaged groups. Yet Samoan dreams indicate that even meanings critical to purposes of domination are dissolved by and reconstituted in dreams.

Hegemonies are only persuasively naturalized through internalization, by becoming the structural categories through which we perceive, think, feel, desire, and so forth. In this regard, a state of mind that continually undermines internalized cultural categories is particularly important. Dreams, the Samoan case will demonstrate, reflect critically on racial categories while showing them and (indeed cultural schemas generally) to be inherently unstable.

From a political perspective, the idea that dreams corrode hegemonic categories like race sounds salutary. But the nightly dissolution of our cultural universes is potentially disquieting as well. Discomfort with and sometimes terror in dreams can be read as a reaction to this dissolution of all fixed meanings. Through the analysis of a teenage Samoan girl I call Penina, this chapter shows that in postcolonial and transnational circumstances this dynamic instability tends to bleed through into the waking world, undermining stable conventionalized meanings. This permeation can make people feel victimized—as if the world is unreliable and there is no fixed point from which to exercise leverage. Yet this historical situation also affords a richness of possibility. It is after all people themselves, the primary processes of their imaginations, that precipitate this continual transformation of meanings and within it a quest for new opportunities to realize themselves and their desires.

This chapter also addresses the role dreams can play in discovering cultural psychology. As Eggan points out (1952, 477–78), ethnographers seldom know their subjects as do psychoanalysts, yet dream analysis relies upon the subjects' willingness and ability to open themselves (cf. Spiro, chapter 9). I illustrate how traditional analytic techniques can be converted into

projective exercises. These exercises permit subjects a greater degree of openness that can provide them insight and can allow ethnographers to use dreams to give thickness to studies of culture.

The relation of memory to dreaming is an important question in contemporary psychology.¹² In sleep, as sensory stimulation recedes, we recoup what we are in danger of forgetting by integrating daily memories into existing cognitive structures (Hunt 1989; Foulkes 1985). I connect personally to this idea: often as I start to slip off to sleep, I remember with alarm tasks I had meant to accomplish, but had forgotten in the whirl of daily existence. It makes sense that dreams should continue what the hypnagogic period begins.

In “Memory, Emotion, and the Imaginal Mind” (chapter 6), Michele Stephen proposes that dreams are a special form of remembering. Daily remembering articulates experience with a semantic code. Dreaming articulates emotionally significant events with the imaginal mind’s configurational memory system. Similarly, Lacan believes we live conscious life predominately in a world of words where sequential thought is the basis of our identities—the Symbolic (1977b). But there is another form of mind that is backgrounded in early life—the Imaginary (Lacan 1968). This is where we live in dreams. In the gap between the semantic and the imaginal mind lies the unbridgeable distance between the dream-as-dreamt and the dream-as-told.¹³ This distance, Stephen believes, explains why it is difficult to remember dreams and trances in our normal waking state. To me, Stephen’s model further suggests that in order to translate dreams back into words (first in remembrance, later in relating them to others), we mediate between these forms of mind.

Spinning off Stephen’s memory map, I suggest the remembered dream and the reported dream are similar to the recall of someone recovering from amnesia. As in amnesia, memory plays a hide-and-seek game in dream reporting, which could be attributed to the problems of translating an image-based form of memory into verbal memory. Remembered and reported dreams, then, would appear as a middle way between forms of mind.

Stephen’s chapter raises further questions for me. Are the memories of artists and mystics (or left-handers) different from most people’s? Are their semantic and imagistic memories less separated? Contrary to Lacan (1977b), Obeyesekere argues in *The Work of Culture*, (1990, 65–68) that in some places, for example Sri Lanka, the imaginal mind is not backgrounded. There the division between waking life and dream life is not emphasized and dream experience is looked upon as valid. Would the semantic memories and the configurational memories of Sri Lankans be as radically demarcated from one another as those of Westerners? In some cultures, American culture, for example (Lutz 1990), women are regarded as

emotional. Is emotive- configurational memory less backgrounded for them? Probably everyone's memory needs to be charted as running between the semantic and the emotive- configurational poles of a larger spectrum. Activity along this spectrum may be as characterized by differential dual processing or, as in the images of modern physics, by moment-to-moment oscillations (sparked by context or biology) from one position to another.

Although Stephen's chapter constitutes a theoretical reflection rather than an ethnographic study, she illustrates her points through several dreams—for example, that of her housekeeper in Bali, Wayan. Wayan dreams that Stephen's big beautiful white dog, Timpal, has nothing to eat. This dream represents what Wayan needs to remember. At the time of the dream, Wayan was neglecting Stephen's house because she was terribly busy with preparations for the ceremonial adoption of herself and three siblings by her previously neglectful extended family (along with a tooth-filing ceremony for the youngest one). The dream articulates these events with several emotion-charged memories: (a) Wayan's parents were not able to care adequately for her as a child; she was often hungry and commented to Stephen that Timpal ate better than many Balinese people. (b) Stephen had become a mother figure for Wayan since her mother's death. (c) Wayan mothered the younger sibling who was to get the tooth-filing.

Balinese file the canines because these teeth (and presumably actual canines as well) represent to them humans' aggressive animal-like nature. It is likely that Wayan felt aggression throughout her life toward the significant others on whom she had depended, but who had so often left her unsatisfied. Probably she also felt guilt in her relations with them because of this aggression, as well as in her relations with those others to whom she now owed mothering (such as Timpal) and whom she herself at times neglected. By neglecting Timpal, Wayan implicitly identifies herself as a bad mother and *with* her parents and extended family. But inasmuch as Wayan was a neglected little girl who went hungry, she is also like Timpal. In my terms, Timpal can also be seen as a counteridentity—an animal with his canines intact who would still like to bite back. Ironically, the neglected Timpal seems also to represent all those Balinese who go hungry while white visitors lavishly feed their beautiful white dogs. This dream, then, may also be what I call in chapter 5 a "black and white" dream, in which postcolonial emotions are represented through color symbolism.

Part 3: Self-Revelation and Dream Interpretation

All chapters herein consider the nature of dreaming as well as the activities of dream telling and interpreting. In parts 1 and 2 the accent falls

on the former and in part 3 on the latter. In parts 1 and 2 we also emphasized the self and intrapsychic relations; in part 3 we explore, invoking Jessica Benjamin's words, "what happens in the field of self and other" (1988, 20) vis-à-vis the dream. Benjamin develops an intersubjective view of the self as developing out of mutual recognition. The dream is, perhaps in every society, a complex context in which recognition is negotiated because in dream telling people both reveal and disguise themselves. Recognition is negotiated in dream recounting through this dynamic of hiding and showing—for the dream circulates around silenced and inarticulate aspects of self and of self/other relations with the power to breach social relations. Let us turn to psychoanalysis as a Western prototype of the work of interpretation and for engagement with others in the context of the dream.

In psychoanalysis, interpretation occurs in the context of the therapy session; the dream is taken as a guide to the dreamer's psychological problems. The interchange between public culture and the private self is represented, acted out in microcosm if you will, between analyst and analysand. Transference and countertransference are an indirect dialogue between these two, which takes place partially through dreams. This dialogue is indirect in that it occurs between the lines—hidden in nonverbal messages and dream images—rather than in transparent verbal messages. It is indirect because it is communication with inextricably mixed motives.

Lacan, for example, characterizes Freud's analytic relationship with a lesbian who tells Freud dreams of heterosexual love. Her homosexual desires are represented in her dreams by reversal. Her dreams, then, seem to be a deceit aimed at expression (of her forbidden desires), but not at communication. Yet, according to Lacan, through these dreams the woman says to Freud, "*You want me to love men, you will have as many dreams about love of men as you wish.* It is defiance in the form of derision" (1977a, 39, emphasis in the original). Lacan believes that Freud symbolizes her father to this woman, who she would defy; he also represents Lacan's "law of the father"—the normative cultural world that insists she should be heterosexual. The dreamer is mocking Freud (and the public world with him) by leading him astray, and making a mockery of the analytic encounter as well. If the dreamer might like to get away with this deceit, what good is derision and mockery if its object does not get the message? Interpretation is an inevitable part of such rich and circuitous communication. It is like the dream itself—multi-layered, multivocal, and ambiguous.

For Lacan "the experience of the dream" is "that which floats everywhere, that which marks, stains, spots the text of any dream communication" with one overriding sentiment: "I am not sure, I doubt" (1977a, 35). This essential ambiguity is a "colophon" in the margins of the dream that points to its significance (Lacan 1977a, 44). The irremediable ambiguity of dreams,

their inability to become a conventional and hence transparent form of communication, instigates hermeneutical activity that transports dream symbols out of private reality and back into social life. Crapanzano (chapter 10) argues that dreams' ambiguity provokes "interpretive anxiety"—a compulsion to ascribe a graspable meaning to them that circumvents their refusal to accommodate mundane norms of thought and action. Alternatively, one may react to dreams' irreducible ambiguity by denying legitimacy to the process of interpretation—dismissing interpretive activity in principle. The insistence that if dreams do not have one true meaning, a meaning that fully preexists the interpretive act, they have no meaning worth thinking about, is simply another form of interpretive anxiety. Evidence of both types of anxiety can be found in cultural approaches to the dream, as we will see below.

In "Dreams That Speak: Experience and Interpretation" (chapter 7), Erika Bourguignon discusses dreams that, from the local perspective, do not require interpretation. Interpretations are so much a part of the fabric of these dreams that they seem to come preinterpreted. What is actually seen in the dream is regarded as secondary, if not irrelevant. Preinterpretation, Bourguignon tells us, bypasses the manifest level of the dream in favor of a dream message. What indigenes see as the message is likely to dramatically diverge from what a psychoanalyst would consider the dream's latent meaning. Yet this message inspires a course of action that might well be undertaken if, from a psychoanalytic viewpoint, the dreamer had understood this latent meaning. Thus the Haitian Annette, visiting the country with Bourguignon, dreams of her boyfriend in the city. Annette sees the dream as a message from the female spirit Ezili: namely, a complaint from Ezili that Annette is neglecting her shrine back in the city. From the psychoanalytic perspective, the latent content is still encoded; it is Annette's desire to return to her home and boyfriend, despite having led a Western authority figure (Bourguignon) to the country purportedly to work with her on trance. In response to the dream, however, Annette tells Bourguignon that she must return to the city—acting as she would if she had understood the latent meaning.

Ezili and the several other spirits Annette meets in her dreams could be seen as representing the essential multiplicity of personhood in those societies where spirits and possession are salient. People in cultures that treat the self as unitary tend to preach faith in one God; people in cultures that see the self as role based and multiple tend to experience a plethora of spirits (Levy, Mageo, and Howard 1996). In these spirit cultures, communication in dreams and elsewhere flows freely between divine and human worlds (Shulman and Stroumsa 1999, 5). This communication relies on being able to translate the language of spirits into human language, that is on a system of preinterpretation.

Traditional western psychotherapeutic styles are confessional (Foucault 1990). Confession is a largely unidirectional form of communication in which the confessor speaks and the listener—a priest or psychoanalyst—occasionally makes pronouncements that grant absolution. Absolution retrospectively amends the division between internalized precepts and lived action. In Haiti, by way of contrast, it is the spirits who make pronouncements through dreams and through the mouths of those who relate them. These dream pronouncements at once displace and support the agency of the dreamer, prospectively sanctioning what would otherwise be a socially censured course of action.

From a western psychological perspective, Ezili is a subself fragment—a dissociated aspect of Annette that is not conscious and with which she does not identify. Annette's case suggests that the dream, like a trance state, is a venue in which people can (unbeknownst to their conscious self and wearing different personae) express and even find recognition for repressed/repudiated elements of self without the onus of personal responsibility. Ezili could also be seen as what I call a counteridentity: the agentive self in a society that valorizes deference. Rather than struggling against this counteridentity, Annette simply follows its injunctions.

In trance-possession cultures many people, like Annette, seem more comfortable with agency in the third person—agency attributed to a spirit whom they serve as “horse” or devotee. Displacing agency onto a spirit allows for independent action, while the individual, at least publicly, defers to social relationships and responsibilities. In Annette's dream, it is the spirit Ezili who exercises agency by commanding her to return to the city. This displaced agency permits Annette to honor the Haitian value of deference in hierarchical relationships while doing precisely what she wants. Haitian dream interpretation intimates that ways of thinking and acting provoked by dreams counterpoint internalized cultural schemas even while they appear to validate them. And yet rather than offering a radical critique of the Haitian world, Ezili allows Annette to accommodate complex feelings about Westerners as colonial authorities (owed a high degree of deference) within the Haitian cultural order. Haitian dream interpretation seems to position the dream as an antistructural moment that supports social structure by keeping it supple (cf. Turner 1977).

Waud H. Kracke, in “Dream: Ghost of a Tiger, A System of Human Words” (chapter 8), draws parallels between verbal communication and dreams. Dreams, he tells us, often borrow not only vocabularies, but also syntax and thesauruses from culture. An example of a vocabulary borrowed from culture would be someone whose latent dream thoughts concerned a condom, but who dreamed about a condom as a raincoat. When a culture contributes syntax, a dream paradigm is inscribed within the dream itself.

Thus it is often said that people in Jungian analysis have archetypal dreams, while those in psychoanalysis have dreams replete with the kind of symbolism central to Freud's view of the dream. Haitians, we have seen, think they dream of that world the Haitian system of dream interpretation suggests they will find—even when the surface story of the dream does not obviously reflect it. Dream thesauruses are standardized equivalencies between a dream image and a preestablished meaning, which Bourguignon calls preinterpretation. Then dreaming of A is consistently read to mean that the dream is about B as, for example, in Freud's view of concave and convex objects as signifying sexual body parts, or in the Haitian equation of identifiable types of dream figures with certain spirits. Dream thesauruses bring the evocative and indeterminate character of dream images closer to a language-like code.

Symbols and symbol systems appropriated from culture (like raincoats and paradigms of dream analysis) may be inscribed in the dream. But what about equivalencies between dream images and standardized meanings: aren't they in the interpretation? Parintintin shamans use their culture's dream thesauruses within the dream itself. By intentionally dreaming of a symbol, the shaman seeks to create an event in the world that this symbol would ordinarily predict.

I suggest in chapter 2 that dreams have critical implications for the cultural order: they reveal our embeddedness in and also our resistance to this order. But systems of dream interpretation may subvert these resistances. In this vein, Kracke shows that dream thesauruses can distance dreamers from anxiety-ridden conflicts, particularly when they appear on the surface of the dream, and hence may be a way of avoiding underlying dream thoughts. Kracke recounts the case of his Parintintin friend Manezinho, who dreams of his comrade's big penis and of getting a haircut (in psychoanalytic terms, signifying castration anxiety). Using a dream thesaurus learned from his father, Manezinho interprets both the penis and the haircut dreams as prophesying hunting success. Kracke believes these dreams are really about guilt and fear constellated around Manezinho's desire for his cousin (a union that the Parintintin see as incestuous) and his concomitant desire to get rid of his father (who represents the societal law forbidding incest). Unlike Haitian dreams, Manezinho's dreams do not abet a subterranean form of agency and an antistructural moment of acting out. Rather, the conventionalized system of equivalencies through which his dreams are understood merely distracts him from troubling feelings about others that could potentially undermine his relationships to them.

There is, I suggest, a range of possible attitudes towards the dream reflected in styles of interpretation. At one extreme one finds attitudes that reject interpretation and dismiss dreams as an errant form of mind. Along with the dream, these attitudes dismiss those reactions against the cultural

order that are often symbolized in them. In the middle range are attitudes that honor dreams in name, but use interpretation to camouflage the dreamer's discontents and the implicit cultural critique they offer. At the other extreme are attitudes that honor dreams and use interpretation to listen to all the messages that they convey. Haitian and Parintintin cultures support middle-range attitudes. Yet the Haitian system of dream interpretation—which camouflages the dream's anti-structural message while encouraging the dreamer to act upon it—seems to support listening to the dream better than the Parintintin system.

Melford E. Spiro's "The Anthropological Import of Blocked Access to Dream Associations" (chapter 9) examines the case of Ms. B., one of his psychoanalytic clients. Ms. B.'s dreams suggest that public value systems, no matter how benign, generate intrapsychic conflicts that pose difficulties in discovering and abiding with oneself. Ms. B. has feminist values, yet has dreams of sexual enslavement that are a source of shame. She puts off telling Spiro about her dreams of forced fellatio and intercourse with sailors until the seventh month of analysis. Ms. B. also dreams of being poked, eaten and groped by witches. One could see in Ms. B.'s dreams internalized images critically representing both the schemas of feminism (the witches) and of male dominance (the sailors). These two schemas become mediums for pleasure and humiliation—a brew that Ms. B.'s dreaming mind continues to stir. The psychoanalytic endeavor aims at the development of critical self-awareness. In this tradition, Spiro challenges Ms. B., and us with her, to face all our contradictions, whatever their relation to culturally idealized models of the self.

What is consistent in Ms. B.'s dreams is a radical lack of agency: it is always her alters, either female witches or male sailors, who undertake or compel action. One is reminded of Jessica Benjamin's analysis of the problem of domination in the pornographic novel *The Story of O* (1988, 55–62). In O's story, as in B.'s dream, the female is always an object acted upon by others. O again and again acquiesces in the transgression of her body's boundaries and to her lover's demands that she be "always available and open" (Benjamin 1988, 57). Benjamin believes these sentiments derive from an early relational situation in which only the father is seen as a powerful agent. The girl, then, has no model for agency in her own sex and can only acquire it through identification with a powerful male other. Bondage and slavery are symbolic for O of relinquishing all sense of difference and separateness in order to remain connected to the Other (Benjamin 1988, 59). Where O's story and B.'s dreams differ is that both males and females represent powerful others for B.

Might the drunken sailors and the witches be Ms. B.'s counteridentities—her own capacity for agency in alienated form? Like Annette's dreams

in Bourguignon's chapter, Ms. B.'s dreams suggest that she has in some measure dissociated her capacity for agentive action. Just as Ezili can be seen as a dissociated aspect of Annette's personality, the sailors and witches may be repudiated/repressed aspects of Ms. B., which she can express in dream life without the onus of personal responsibility. She is compelled rather than free to act in both these dreams; dreams themselves may serve, as does spirit possession in many cultures, as a denial that she is responsible for what these subself fragments do. One wonders if a dissociation of agency will work as well for Ms. B. in American society as it does for Annette in Haitian society.

Spiro's chapter also raises the question I confront in chapter 2: Where is agency? Is it in the conscious intention of the actor? Or is agency in the denied/hidden movements of the self against the demands and contradictions of a cultural world? Or, possibly, does agency lie in negotiating the dynamic interactions of these two?

Vincent Crapanzano's "Concluding Reflections" (chapter 10), can be viewed as a phenomenology of dream relating. Phenomenology begins with deconstruction—the dismantling of cultural categories that normally structure, but also limit perception. Crapanzano begins by deconstructing the category of the dream, underlining that all we have is dream accounts, not dreams themselves. The dream "seizes us . . . like any trickster," Crapanzano tells us, "by slipping away."

Dream accounts are performative. Interpretations, like accounts, reperform the dream. Reperformances are always within a particular social context, which leads us to recast dreams in the conventions of that context, however unwittingly.¹⁴ Reperformance that does not recognize itself as such may lose track of the original context, which Crapanzano believes has much to tell us about culture and the self, as well as about the place of the dream in relation to them. To be within a social context is to be engaged with others, embedding the dream in what Crapanzano calls "a series of interlocutory nestings." If dream performances are multiply situated in and engaged with the cultural world, Crapanzano tells us, potentially they retain the dream's ability to enact breach, permeability, and fluidity within it.

Out of all these chapters comes a view of dreaming and of the self. The self appears as multiple and the dream as doing the work of mediation. This mediation is not directed at making a unitary self, but at crafting open systems of communication. The various chapters show communication that takes place in dreams to be between people's preobjective perceptions and their cultural schemas, existing narratives of self and experiences that do not fit these narratives (such as migrants' transnational experience), self schemas and daily life, hegemonic social categories and the free play of imaginal thinking within the person, emotional experience and the configurational memory system. Dream interpretation appears as a context in which the

person's capacity for agency, creativity, and reflection are to varying degrees exercised or abrogated. But in every instance the agency, creativity, and reflection that we find through dreams and their interpretations are not those of Descartes's "I"—identified solely with the ratiocinative individual. Rather they are authored interrelationally in the context of complex emotions and of subtle, often hidden and subliminal, social communications in which we exercise influence on one another.

Notes

I thank Robert Van de Castle for his comments and generous support for this volume. I also thank Mary Bloodsworth for reading and commenting on this chapter. I thank Troy Wilson for his excellent work on the index.

1. See for example C. G. Seligmen 1924, 1932; Lincoln 1935, 107–131; Róheim 1946, 1949, 1950; Devereux 1951.

2. On Mead's Samoan work and Freudian theory see further Mead 1959 and Mageo 1988, 28–37.

3. Other Culture and Personality anthropologists who investigated dreams were A. Irving Hallowell, George Devereux, and Weston Le Barre. Samples of their work can be found in Von Grunbaum and Caillois's *The Dream and Human Societies* (1966).

4. See for example White and Kirkpatrick 1985; Lutz 1988.

5. See for example Homiak 1987; Graham 1995.

6. The belief that people's spirit doubles travel in sleep is common in many of the cultures anthropologists study. See for example Basso 1987, 88–89; Herdt 1987, 58; Levy 1973, 374.

7. On egocentrism and sociocentrism, see for example Murray 1993; Hollan 1992, Markus and Kitayama 1991; White and Kirkpatrick 1985; Schweder and Bourne 1984; Levy 1983, and Mauss [1938] 1985. For critiques of the egocentric/sociocentric dichotomy see Spiro 1993; Mageo 1998, 1995, 2002a; Mageo and Knauff 2002.

8. Sullyvan (1953) called those aspects of experience lost to awareness as a result of encountering strong negative evaluations in the course of socialization the "not-me."

9. See also Hofstadter and Dennett 1981; Tedlock 1987, 26; Price-Williams 1987.

10. See for example Lutz 1988; Strathern 1990; Markus and Kitayama 1991; Wagner 1991; Battaglia 1995; and Benjamin 1988. Cultural theorists also argued that the idea that people are unitary and autonomous is illusory. See for example Althusser 1971 and Derrida 1978.

11. For an overview of this work see D'Andrade 1961. D'Andrade himself believes that there is "no simple relation between the culture and the manifest content of dreams" (1961, 313). Rather the manifest dream reflects the needs and conflicts of individuals in particular societies.

12. For a synopsis of contemporary psychological research on the relation of dreaming to memory see Van de Castle 1994, 274–76.

13. On the difference between the dream experience and the dream report see further Crapanzano chapter 10 and 1980; and Van de Castle 1994, 280–81.

14. On the effect of social context on dreaming and dream reporting see also Van de Castle 1994, 281–87 and Hunt 1989, 12.