

The Phenomenology of Dreams in the Viewpoints from Freud, From Jung and from Boss, Plus One New Aspect

José Henrique Rocha Dias Correia

Licentiate in Psychological Sciences, Rua Cidade de Bissau, 47, 5^oB, 1800-075 Lisboa, Portugal

*Corresponding Author: joseh.dcorreia@gmail.com

Copyright © 2014 Horizon Research Publishing All rights reserved.

Abstract Dream analysis has been considered as an important part of psychotherapy in Psychoanalysis, Analytical Psychology and Daseinanalysis. In this article I reviewed the basis belonging to the three original and specific theories for dream analysis and interpretation from Freud, Jung and Boss. The functioning of each theory will be illustrated by means of the analysis and interpretation of one typical and famous dream of the correspondent literature. The new conclusion has been that dreaming apparently adjusts itself to the theory that will be used to analyze and interpret the dreams.

Keywords Analytical Psychology, Daseinanalysis, Dreams, Psychoanalysis

1. Introduction

Sigmund Freud (1856-1939), Carl Gustav Jung (1875-1961) and Medard Boss (1903-1990) were three psychiatrists who were native German speakers. They produced their original and specific theories for the analysis and the interpretation of dreams. These theories have become individually integrated into Psychoanalysis, Analytical Psychology and Daseinanalysis, that turned up, respectively, as the schools of Psychology founded by those three authors. All the three theories that were presented have their own particular usefulness for the analysis and the interpretation of dreams, as we shall notice. They are all hermeneutic theories, that is, they are bound to the meaning or sense that we must attribute to dreams and to the possibility that these meaning and sense are in fact discernible. We are going to condense, then, each theory, one by one, in what has been essential for their specificities, in what have been their analytical and interpretative foundations. The functioning of each one of the theories will be illustrated by means of the interpretation of one dream that has been considered one typical and famous dream in the correspondent specific literature. Then a conclusion will be drawn naturally after the observation of something that has been common and shared by the three hermeneutic theories, something that will be patent to anyone following the

analysis and the interpretations that belong properly to each of the theories, and that will be cleared before the conclusion of the paper: that dreaming apparently adjusts itself to the theory that will be used to analyze and interpret the dreams.

2. Method

The survey of the literature used to write up this paper was not exhaustive because this is not a review paper, but merely one synthesis based on the literature that is enough and necessary to make the point at the end of the paper. Three worldwide reputable and recognized theories for the analysis and the interpretation of dreams are brought together in a single text, a situation which has not been frequent at all. Methodologically a clear distinction must be made between the functions of dreaming and the meanings of dreams and dreaming. Schredl [1] recently summarized the possible functions of dreaming and he differentiated between the physiological level of sleep associated with dreaming and the psychological level of dreaming. It has been accepted that, physiologically, sleep is crucial for body temperature regulation in homeothermic animals (mammals and birds), prevention of body weight loss, and the efficiency of their immunological system. Psychologically, functions attributed to dreaming have been the consolidation of memories, or an opportunity for the expression of symptomatic mirrored life events, like emotional stresses or traumas, the progressing in patients under intensive psychotherapy, or simply the boosting of creativity. But in spite of Schredl [1] concluding that the question about possible functions for dreaming is the most interesting one, he reserves his own judgment on accepting a sound beneficial effect of dreaming due to immanent methodological issues not yet settled on. Now, one must not confuse function with meaning. Meanings are a wide-ranging and complex psychic reality that goes beyond a single meaning that can be attributed to the exercising of one specific function. And several functions have been investigated for the dreaming process. The hermeutical standpoint regarding the analysis and the interpretation of dreams, and dreaming in general, takes a bold step forward and does not wait for the underpinnings neuroscience tardy

provides for the needs of an immediate action in psychotherapy. The meanings for the life of a patient cannot be limited to a few functions experimentally established by biomedicine or the neurosciences.

3. Results and Discussion

The discussion of the literature consulted is divided in three sections (3.1, 3.2 and 3.3), and sections will deal with one theory *per se* focusing how each one operates through a particularly demonstrative example of a typical dream of its own field, showing how each theory's hermeneutic features are evident, and also with the aim that, at the end of the paper, we can direct ourselves towards one general conclusion founded upon the Hermeneutics that has been shared, in common, by all the three theories. Hence, the discussion will have to be hermeneutic in nature, involved in a profound symbolic language, but this language has never been hermetic for those acquainted with the literature. I do not pretend in no way to sum up against or contradict biomedical visions on the matter of sleep and how this phenomenon generates dreaming. Biomedical explanations are very important, but they do not tell the whole of the truth implicated in the matter. So, this paper falls into a particular line of enquiry inside the vast domain of dream research. The article is one synthesis brought about by the author's long standing interest in the hermeneutics of dream analysis and interpretation.

3.1. Psychoanalysis and Dreams

In 1900 Sigmund Freud published one book with the title "*The interpretation of dreams*" where he exposed his original and new theory for the analysis, the interpretation, and the therapeutic usefulness of dreams [2]. In this piece of work, inside which the basis of the theory was illustrated by means of the interpretation of several isolated dreams dreamt by different people and by Freud himself, Freud called our attention to the distinction between the manifest contents and the latent contents in dreams (*ibidem*, p. 172), and he considered this contrast as indispensable for the understanding of dreams. That is, in dreams there would always be one discernible plot that becomes accessible as it is to consciousness, plus one hidden story, that would lurk underneath the first. He also pointed out to the fact that dreams are constantly the open or disguised satisfaction of desires proscribed by the dreamer (*ibidem*, pp. 136-145, 473, 529-549). He tried to explain dreaming by causes that are resident in the past of the woken life of the dreamer, in the belief that all psychological facts hold an explicable cause that resides in other phenomena of a psychic nature, or belonging to the relations between people in the past time of the person under analysis (*ibidem*, pp. 58-60). In parallel, he considered dreams as the royal road to the unconscious, trying to prove to others in his own way, empirically, the psychic reality of the existence of an unconscious part inside

the human mind, a claim that had been regarded as true by previous and numerous authors. Being the pillars for the psychoanalytical doctrine of Freud the notions of sexual drives or life instinct (libido) plus the Oedipus complex (the Oedipus conflict is constantly present during the practice of Psychoanalysis) and because all these have an unconscious source, dreams would be revelations of them coming from the unconscious part of the mind and eventually reaching consciousness. In spite of this, the language of dreams would remain obscure, bizarre, because of the existence of a censorship, an activity that would correspond to the execution of the so called work of the dream (*ibidem*, pp. 276-277). The purpose of this censor was supposed to be the preservation of sleep while we are dreaming, in order to prevent crude emotions or affects to disrupt sleep, and consequentially the aim is to disguise these crude emotions by associating them with anodyne mental representations. In this way would be implemented the mechanisms for the formation of the manifest dream, that have been the condensation (*ibidem*, pp. 278-302), the displacement (*ibidem*, pp. 303-307), and the symbolizing. Symbolizing is one very important mechanism for sexual content show up undercover, represented in dreams by something that takes their place (the symbol). Usually, an elongated object in dreams can be invariably regarded as a phallic symbol, while hollow or rounded objects symbolize always the female genitalia.

One technical procedure paramount to the interpretation of dreams in Psychoanalysis is the free association technique, a unique originality from Psychoanalysis, through which the patient has been supposed to talk freely, excluding nothing that comes to mind as bizarre as it may look to himself, in relation to any fragment or element under analysis in one dream (fundamental rule in Psychoanalysis). By this technique the analyst can put into context the dream data so that, subsequently, he/she can infer from these the appropriate meaning for one specific dream. The neurotic conflict (that has been derived from sexual drives and from the incongruity of the Oedipus conflict) is found at the vortex of the latent contents of the dream that has been, according to Freud, produced after some manifest contents were processed by the work of the dream. The knowledge of the essence of the neurotic conflict, one patient at a time, a conflict that resides in the personal unconscious of every individual and that it is manifested always through dreams coming from his/hers unconscious, can be obtained after dream interpretation and allows for the clarification of the etiology and the pathogenesis of the neurosis, case by case. Posteriorly, the awareness of the conflict permits a cognitive reorganization in the patient, and the cure of the neurosis will ensue from it. For the analytical cure developed by Freud for neurotic diseases the contributions have been not only derived from the interpretation of patients' dreams, but also from the interpretation of the transference neurosis that is elicited by the therapeutic method.

Quoting the very words from Freud concerning the full report on the hysterical neurosis of Dora [3] (p. 11):

“...a thorough investigation of the problem of dreams is an indispensable prerequisite for any comprehension of the mental processes in hysteria and the other psychoneuroses, and that no one who wishes to shirk that preparatory labour has the smallest prospect of advancing even a few steps into this region of knowledge. Since, therefore, this case history presupposes the knowledge of the interpretation of dreams, it will seem highly unsatisfactory to any reader to whom this presupposition does not apply. Such a reader will find only bewilderment in these pages instead of the enlightenment he is in search of, and he will certainly be inclined to project the cause of his bewilderment on to the author and to pronounce his views fantastic.”

More from Freud on this case study has been (*ibidem*, p. 11):

“...it would be wrong to suppose that dreams and their interpretation occupy such a prominent position in all psycho-analysis as they do in this example.

Following additional considerations by Freud in 1905, adding to what he wrote in 1900 about dreaming and its causality, and by means of which he recognized afterwards that the excitatory causes for dreams emerge through free associations, he calls his readers' attention to (*ibidem*, pp. 67-68):

“...I argued in my book, *The interpretation of dreams*, that every dream is a wish which is represented as fulfilled, that the representation acts as a disguise if the wish is a repressed one, belonging to the unconscious, and that except in the case of children's dreams only an unconscious wish or one which reaches down into the unconscious has the force necessary for the formation of a dream. I fancy my theory would have been more certain of general acceptance if I had contented myself with maintaining that every dream had a meaning, which could be discovered by means of a certain process of interpretation; and that when the interpretation had been completed the dream could be replaced by thoughts which would fall into place at an easily recognizable point in the waking mental life of the dreamer. I might then have gone on to say that the meaning of a dream turned out to be of as many different sorts as the processes of waking thought; that in one case it would be a fulfilled wish, in another a realized fear, or again a reflection persisting on into sleep, or an intention (as in the instance of Dora's dream), or a piece of creative thought during sleep, and so on. Such a theory would no doubt have proved attractive from its simplicity, and it might have been supported by a great many examples of dreams that had been satisfactorily interpreted, as for instance by the one which has been analyzed in these pages.”

Consequently, I will transcribe the first of the two dreams reported by Freud in his case study named Dora, in order to put in evidence the workings of the Oedipus conflict and how it creates the satisfaction of a desire in dreams, two factors that are at the foundations of the doctrine of Psychoanalysis.

The first dream is a recurrent one, and it was dreamt repetitively in a similar way before the psychotherapy with Freud was begun. The recurrent character signals one

unsolved and persistent problem in the dreamer's life, with the concomitant renewal in time of the satisfaction in dreams of the desire concerned. The recurring nature might have been a symptom of rigidity in the affective life of the dreamer, something that brings her closer to a pathological condition that as a matter of fact was fully confirmed *a posteriori*. The manifest content of the dream is the following (*ibidem*, p. 64):

“A house was on fire. My father was standing beside my bed and woke me up. I dressed quickly. Mother wanted to stop and save her jewel-case; but father said: I refuse to let myself and my two children be burnt for the sake of your jewel-case. We hurried downstairs, and as soon as I was outside I woke up.”

A house in a dream is a symbol of the human personality and its structure [2] (p. 341). In the exposition one house was on fire, an image that can be understood as a personality consumed by the passions of the soul. Freud, himself, corroborates this interpretation when he makes reference to [3] (p. 72):

“But fire is not only used as the contrary of water, it also serves directly to represent love (as in the phrase “to be consumed with love”). So that from “fire” one set of rails runs by way of this symbolic meaning to thoughts of love.”

Then, the outset of the dream has been an introduction to the dreamer's problem: her personality had been overwhelmed, consumed on disintegration, by the instincts that determine the varieties of the passions for love. This is a plausible interpretation. There is, initially, a detour in the dream to associate the problem strictly in the dream, as far as what it is referred, to one house, in a general sense, that is on fire. This can stand for the collective sharing in the problem. But immediately after in the dream the problem becomes restricted to the dreamer when the plot begins to develop and it becomes clear that she is sleeping in her own bed (a symbol of one place and one cyclical timing reserved to the spontaneous and intimate expression of the unconscious, free as far as possible of the censorship of the *Superego* but not free of the workings of the censor of the dream) with her father by her side. She obviously sleeps in her bedroom, one symbol of the private and intimate space concerning the personality of the dreamer. The father, seated by her side, protectively, awakens her up from her sleep in which she makes contact, dreamingly distant from reality, with the perils (metaphorically represented by the fire in the house that jeopardizes the bedroom) threatening her intimacy. The situation also symbolizes the influence of the father as an activator of intimate feelings of a securing nature (in spite of the fact that these feelings of security are illusory because they do not disentangle the Oedipus complex situation) in the dreamer's conscience; there is something in the person of her father that affects her conscious feelings, and this corresponds to the protection that the daughter senses that has been coming from the father in her life's social relationships. It is the feeling of the tutelage that in dreams became a fulfilled wish that exerts influence over the feelings Dora experiences about her social relations during

her awakened life. This feeling will prolong itself into the personal unconscious of Dora while she will trust upon her father the power of rescuing her from the dangers and the insecurity of the love consummation outside the Oedipus frame. All this has been elaborated inside the relative security of the dream world, just as if one deficiency had taken place in the dreamer's consciousness regarding these psychological perspectives, a gap that the recurrent dream attempts to bridge repeatedly; this phenomenon psychologically specific also should be taken into account if the adequate reading of the dream is to be noted. Afterwards, she dresses up quickly. The garments are a symbolic image of the *persona*, of the mask that one uses socially to instrumental achieving our aims in society. Here the message could be that amidst the Oedipus situation there is a hastily attempt, not very convincing, to clear up the problem reaching for an attitude that is short of maturity. Following, in the plot, it comes upon the dream stage another dream figure that is very potent: the mother. We are now getting closer to the theatre of the Oedipus conflict, with the performance of the rival. The mother wants at all price to preserve her position of power as one the progenitors, the matrix of the offspring, the owner of the jewels box, one symbol of the shell of Venus, the female genitalia. The interpretation of this symbolic occurrence in these terms is corroborated by Freud in his text of 1905 (*ibidem*, p. 91). To keep her *status quo* in the Oedipus situation the mother suggests a conservative attitude in the family (metaphorically represented by the standstill of the running away from the house on fire and by the rescuing of the jewels-case) but, and this is the satisfaction in dreams of the Oedipus desire to take over the rival by the possession of the contra sexual figure, the father, an opposition appears on part of him and Dora wins out her rival, even if only in dreams. The Oedipus wish was fulfilled in the dream for Dora, but in an indirect and veiled way. In the dream the father recuses to rescue the maternal genitalia value, symbolized by the jewels-case, in change for another biologic value connected to the protective instinct towards the offspring. The offspring (Dora and her brother) must not be consumed psychologically by the simultaneously causal and conflicting factor of the Oedipus complex. In the sequence of this unilateral stance to the problem (that points out only to a fraction of the resolution of the Oedipus complex) the family quickly comes downstairs and reaches the outside, and the dreamer wakes up. This is the supposed creative solution (as we indicated above that Freud would admit) to the psychic problem. But here the solution shown has not been totally clear: just that there should be a public, manifest, separation between the members of the family, that is, to assume a distance that permits a cool down of the lurking and strongly affected feelings between family members, destructively undermined by unconscious drives originating from the personal unconscious of each member, like the analysis of this particular dream demonstrates. The exterior that the figures reach after coming downstairs can be faced as the public space, the collective ground, the social living, in a

movement in opposition to the orgasmic sense classically attributed by Psychoanalysis (to climb stairs in a dream can mean to reach the climax driven by the strength of the desire; in Psychoanalysis, because of its impregnation in the Freudian theory of sexuality, to climb up stairs means to feel an orgasm after having had sexual intercourse [2] (pp. 349, 359, 364), where the urgency of the separation between family members is an healthy one, up to the point of allowing for a way out of a house that symbolizes (metaphorically) a conflict that cannot be changed in no other way so far. In this state of affairs it is imperative to return to a conscientious life, in the awakened *Ego*, what is indicated by the timely awakening of the sleep in my opinion. Before starting her therapy with Freud this was the last solution provided by dreams that was possible under the circumstances, dictated by the unconscious of Dora to herself. The recurring nature of the dream concerned denounces the mental stiffness of Dora in relation to the solution of the Oedipus complex, just as it had been affecting her. The persistence in time and in dreams of the scenes is one clear symptom of a neurosis (a conflict that has not been resolved and that implies a proscribed wish, frustrated in reality by moral inhibitions, but fulfilled in dreams by a compensatory way). Even though dreams are rich in significations their interpretation in light of Psychoanalysis has been against intuition and hence it requires the help of the interpretative theory.

3.2. Analytical Psychology and Dreams

For Carl Gustav Jung, dreams, in spite of their fantastic appearance are also amenable to analysis and found crucial inside the psychotherapy that he developed under the name of Analytical Psychology [4]. Both Jung and Freud accepted the existence of a psychic reality that can be inferred empirically, which consists of an unconscious part in the human mind (a personal unconscious recognized by Freud plus a collective unconscious found out by Jung). These are where dreams come from. According to Jung dreams are related with the dreamer so much forward, concerning the future prospectively, as much as backward, facing the past in the dreamer's life. Additionally, Jung's attribution of meanings to dreams was a conclusion that he, as well as others before him, reached empirically and not deductively. What corroborates the possibility of interpreting dreams and that they have a meaning, potentially at the minimum, has been the factual clinical observations and the therapeutic effects of dream analysis and interpretation in concrete patients, undergoing psychotherapies where such practices are executed.

Jung discerned one dramatic structure to the narrative in most dreams. Dreams invariably begin by an exposition in which there are statements of place, of the identity of the human figures in the dream and, rarely, indications of time. Next the plot begins to unfold and it culminates, emotionally, in the *peripeteia* (*ibidem*, p. 82). Dreams are frequently, but not always, ended by the *lysis* that shows the solution or creative result issued by the unconscious part of the mind for

the drama or problem contained in the dream (*ibidem*, p. 83). The understanding of dreams relies not only in a causal explanation (that Freud cheered) but also in the comprehension of their finality or purpose. That is, in what they mean to the life of the dreamer after a correct interpretation, of the interpretation that makes the most sense and has an efficient consequence upon the change brought about in the dreamer's life. Certainly, there is for Jung one sense of purpose or of striving towards one aim in the dreams from one person night after night. The question about the why of the dream (the causal perspective) should always join the question of the what for has one dreamt (the finality point of view) (*ibidem*, pp. 29, 31). In this regard Jung points out to the presence of the Aristotelian *causa efficiens* as a possibility to explain the genesis of dreams, but he also evokes the Aristotelian *causa finalis* that is supposed to cast light upon the comprehension of the general significance of dreaming.

Concerning dreams' symbolism Jung's stance diverges somehow from Freud's. Freud ended up by means of his fixed symbolism to reduce symbols in dreams to mere signs or symptoms, while Jung keeps an open minded perspective in which the meaning of each and every symbol inside one dream, even though justified by all dream analysis to be included in the dream, has an open character, a functioning in a relation between other mental representations, and the ultimate meaning of the symbol can only be established at the end of taking into account the context of its emergence, what have been the life circumstances of the dreamer and of his/hers predominant conscious orientation before dreaming the particular dream under analysis. The clarification of this context was considered crucial by Jung in order to understand the meaning of one dream or series of dreams, and coherently with this line of reasoning what each individual symbol in a dream means specifically to the dreamer has paramount weight in the interpretation. For instance, Freud reduces all long or sharp objects to symbols of the *phallus* while round or hollow objects would be symbols for the female genitalia. For Jung symbol and context are enormously varied and hence their opportune sense depends deeply on both. The meaning of symbols in dreams for Jung is at the service of a larger project than the mere diagnosis of the etiology and the pathogenesis of a neurosis as for Freud. To discern the meaning of symbols in dreams Freud used an anticipated theorization of what they should represent as symptoms and also made use of causal explanations. Both reasons were amplified as to their validity by the technique of free association. In the Jungian practice free associations are scarce, limited to those in number that are necessary and enough to clarify the diagnosis of the meaning each symbol has for the dreamer in a single dream (something you can only know by asking him/her) and this, in its turn, guides the analyst to the context of the dream, with the intention to comprehend that specific dream into that particular moment in time. The context permits the attribution of meanings to symbols and to arrive at a valid sense for each and every dream. Hence, for Jung one has to

build, dream by dream, the interpretative referent or context. To do so, the therapist has to know pretty well the conscious life of the patient, because if he/she lacks knowledge of the patient's life in the awakened condition plus his/hers life circumstances, it is impossible to do a correct interpretation. Freud would stimulate free associations *ad libitum* to confirm the etiology, the pathogenesis and the diagnosis for one neurosis, case by case, whilst Jung considers the referent or context as indispensable for the understanding and meaning of one dream, asking questions to the dreamer just enough. The knowledge of the dreamers' consciousness is crucial in Jungian analysis for in this theory dreams are supposed to show a compensatory relation with the conscious orientation of the dreamer. So to speak, dreams show messages to the dreamer that stand in a relation of a compensatory communication with the thoughts and the feelings perceived by the subject during his/hers awakened period (by compensation we mean then the emergence in consciousness of otherwise unconscious contents, overlooked during awakening, but that have always been at the service of what Jung has defined as the individuation process, something that I will show below consists of an homeoretic trajectory in the life of every individual). But dreams as a communicative process between the unconscious and the conscience of one person do not have as the only purpose to be compensatory processes. This is just one singular mechanism for the homeostatic regulation of the psyche. Experiences in the life of one person can be compensated one by one, but compensation in dreams in general becomes sub-served under something larger and greater that is the development of the totality of the personality of the dreamer, integrating in a single unit simultaneously the conscious as well as the unconscious (personal and mainly collective) along the life trajectory of the individual. In other words, to realize the assimilation of the *Ego* by a wider personality through a process that is not homeostatic exclusively, but essentially homeoretic in nature. This process continues throughout a person's life and Jung named it the individuation process explained interspersed among his collected works.

The compensatory function in dreams can occur just as with a prospective character as well as with a retrospective character. In the first instance, there is openness towards an alternative reality and a possible modification in the future of the dreamer's life. When the compensatory function comes in a retrospective way its aim is, after dealing with the past life of the dreamer, show that his/hers current life situation is in question, and also what the dreamer thinks (or does somehow overthink) and feels about the present. Jung classified this last type of dream as reductive dreams or negatively compensatory dreams (*ibidem*, p. 45). He also underlined that reductive dreams make claims, dominantly, to infantile sexual desires (Freudian perspective) or to infantile power complexes (Adlerian perspective). In his attempt to classify dreams Jung suggested another class named reaction-dream. These dreams are repetitions of traumatic experiences that behave as autonomous and

dissociated complexes in the sufferer's mind. In this class of dreams, in opposition to what happens in all the others, an interpretation from the standpoint of symbolism and the awareness of its meaning by the dreamer, do not change the nightmares, and only the unforeseen exhaustion of their psychic causes can stop them (*ibidem*, p. 48). Apparently, autonomous and dissociated complexes do not comply with the compensatory mechanism and these pathological complexes are the evidence for the breakdown of the homeostatic mechanism during disease.

There is a final category of dreams for Jung that he named archetypal dreams (*ibidem*, pp. 79-80). Though all dreams are influenced by archetypes during sleep (there are four archetypes most common in dreams, namely, the *Shadow*, the *Anima* exclusive to the dreams of men, the *Animus* exclusive to the dreams of women, and the *Self*, the ultimate archetype for meaningfulness) some dreams, supposedly with a higher relevance for the individuation process, show mythological motives or mythologems or archetypes issuing from the hidden depths of the collective unconscious, compensatory determining dreaming of symbols and impersonal images, shared by the whole of humanity in the territory of the collective unconscious, and in relation to which the dreamer associates poorly because these symbols direct to collective psychic situations, remote and archaic, for the dreamer has no personal conscience of them even though they profoundly affect his/hers singular destiny. This collective unconscious, found out by Jung, is deeper, farfetched, difficulty to access, when compared with the personal unconscious worked out by Freud. The Jungian perspective does not plainly deny the Freudian theory of the unconscious that bases dreaming in wish fulfillment. It just opens a new vista, a parenthesis upon the old viewpoint, saying that in the psyche there is more than wish fulfillment alone. Followers of Jung consider dreams more as a reflection or self portrait of the symbolic and unconscious situation of the dreamer (*ibidem*, p. 51). This situation is of a psychic nature, always features meanings, and dreaming reflects this fact.

A very well established psychological mechanism inside dream psychology according to Jung has been the making of projections (*ibidem*, pp. 52-57). The content from our unconscious are constantly projected, and the process remains mostly unconscious. During dreaming the same process takes place, and it can even reach the point of the object totally composed by means of projections: the *imago* object. The symbolic value of this object, the *imago*, then becomes utterly masked by the very projections that confer upon it values and meanings of a very wide range, in accord with the aims of the projections. The mind, in its natural condition, presupposes the processes of projection through which the libido has been discharged. In dreams, and following Jung, projections are legion and they are the ones responsible for the latent contents of the symbols we dream of. The interpretation of the projections in dreams was named by Jung as the interpretation at the subjective level. He considered that through the projection, when one dreamer

for example, dreams with someone, this someone stands for to the unknown parts, and hence projected, of the personality of the dreamer. The interpretation at the objective level, practiced by Freud, pretended that one symbol in dreams refers invariably to the *phallus* if the object dreamed of was a long or sharp thing, and that therefore the latent contents of the phallic symbol should always report to the sexuality of the dreamer, though his/hers dreams would not be constantly about it even if the dream includes similar objects.

Now, we need to explain archetypes like symbols occurring in dreams which functions establish relations between other mental representations during dreaming, so that they give a general sense to the dreams where they intervene. According to Jung the archetype named the *Shadow* belongs to the sphere of the personal unconscious for the most part and it turns up in dreams as one human figure the same sex as the dreamer's but with an unknown identity [5] (pp. 8-10). This archetype has been the big producer of projections issued by the personal aspects of the inferior, corrupted, degraded, negative and immoral parts of the dreamer who dreams with the *Shadow*. The negative aspects of one person's personality usually are repressed in order to escape from the conscience of the *Ego* where they stir up uneasiness, and hence they appear afterwards in the shape of projections personified by the figure of the *Shadow*. In the dreams of men and women we can also find two other archetypes that are the contra-sexual personifications of the dreamers (*ibidem*, pp. 11-22). In men we find the *Anima* archetype and in women the *Animus* archetype. These represent the feminine (*Eros*) in a man's psyche and the masculine (*Logos*) in a woman's psyche, respectively. These archetypes are strongly projected by the subjects in people of the opposite sex. *Anima* generates projections in the form of one maternal *imago* in a real woman. *Animus* generates projections in the form of one paternal *imago* upon a real man. Both archetypes possess an intense numen that manifests in consciousness when the couples fall in love. The psychic contents projected by *Anima* and by *Animus* can be made conscious after the respective projections have been acknowledged. Thus, the experience with the feminine and the female inside a man can become conscious, but the archetype *Anima*, the projection generating factor, remains submerged in the collective unconscious, far away from volitions. The same applies to *Animus* which can allow a woman to gain consciousness of her experience with the masculine and of masculinity inside herself, once the projections have been removed, but there is no direct knowledge of the nature of the archetype *Animus* in itself, and consequentially no possibility to exert control over it. Archetypes persist unreachable because of their condition of complexes of the collective unconscious. Finally, the archetype of the *Self*, that has been supposed to be the ultimate source of meaningfulness, does not concern only to an intellectual perception of meaning but also to an affective appreciation of value (*ibidem*, pp. 23-35).

In dreams cognitions and affects are intimately united. This double perspective must always be taken into account

when evaluating psychic facts. This is the way the *Self* archetype operates revealing itself as a mythologem of a religious character, because in the human mind it has been factual that therein also resides an *imago Dei* (*ibidem*, p. 31) that expresses by symbols of inert matter, or with phytomorphic, theriomorphic and anthropomorphic natures, all constantly spontaneous symbols of the wholeness and integration of the human personality. The archetype of the *Self* is the master craftsman of the dreaming and the first psychopomp of the individuation process, which has been in its own way a treading enterprise starting from unorganized chaos and reaching a cosmos full of order, harmony and beauty. For Jung this archetype is empirical evidence because it was inferred inductively after the practice of Analytical Psychology and it is not a mere theoretical conjecture, deduced on basis of premise founded upon metaphysical beliefs or exoteric religious experiences.

To illustrate the Jungian analysis and interpretation of dreams I will transcribe one dream dreamt by one male under didactic analysis and a trainee in Analytical Psychology. The dream was documented by Boa [6] and the dreamer himself produced one comment that says (p. 219):

“I had this dream when I was doing my analytical training in Zürich. The evening prior, a friend and I discussed our anxiety about interpreting other people’s dreams.”

The dream is a revelation concerning what are dreams in themselves, what has been their psychic origin, and to what they lead in the life of the dreamer if they are correctly interpreted. The dreamer dreamt, starting from his past, with what he should learn by means of the didactic therapy, while still in a condition of an analyzed individual who had been under training to become shortly a Jungian psychotherapist. Additionally, this very inspired dream concerns the archetype of the *Self* and its psychic expression. Jungian analyst Marie-Louise von Franz (1915-1998) summed up the meaning of this dream with her comment: “...the *Self*, as the center of the dream, introduced itself to him, and said, “I am the maker of the dream. Look at what it is.” (*ibidem*, p. 221). From the point of view of the function of compensation or compensatory function, the dream answers to the anxiety and uncertainty of the dreamer regarding one crucial aspect of his professional and personal life, that is how to interpret dreams. After Jung’s classification of the types of dreams [4] the dream has been prospective and at the same time archetypal. It is [6] (pp. 219-221):

“At the beginning of the dream, I was sitting cross-legged on the ground in the central square of an ancient walled city. A young man full of life and vitality entered the square. He was naked to the waist, and the sun reflected through his long blond hair. He sat down opposite me and told me a dream, which I interpreted. As I interpreted his dream, rocks, huge boulders, fell out of the sky and hit the dream, causing it to split. Chunks flew off, revealing an inner structure to the dream made up entirely of nuts and bolts.

And, as he continued to relate his dream, other boulders fell from the sky. On impact, more chunks flew of the dream, progressively revealing an inner skeleton, which eventually

took the form of a kind of abstract modern sculpture made of iron. I walked over and picked up a chunk that had been knocked off the dream. It was made of bread. I said to the young man, “This demonstrates how a dream must be interpreted. You must know what to discard. It’s just like life.”

Then the dream changed. The youth and I still sat opposite each other, but on the bank of a river. The form which his dream had previously taken had changed. Rather than being composed of the nuts and bolts skeleton and chunks of bread, the dream now formed a pyramid of many colors, with each color forming either a triangle or a square. It was as if this pyramid, about five feet high, was shingled on all sides with thousands of these small colored squares and triangles. And the colors kept changing, an incredible flux of color change. As the color changed in one of the shingles, then another color had to change in another part of the pyramid. The energies were in constant motion. I explained to the youth that this balancing of energy was what dreams were all about. They compensate psychic energy.

Then again the dream changed. The pyramid which had been so beautiful with all the many colors was now composed entirely of shit. And there was another pyramid on top of the base pyramid, but it was invisible. Moreover, the top pyramid was upside down, so that the tips of the two pyramids came together into a central point. But that apex was also invisible. This puzzled me because that point was necessary to hold the structure together. Then the apex began to glow with an intense white light, but there was only light. I looked down at the base pyramid, and as I peered deeply into the pyramid of shit, I realized, “The hand of God is in the shit.” Those were the exact words that came to me.

Then I knew why I couldn’t see the invisible point. That glowing white point was the face of God, and no one looks at the face of God and lives. Just like a hole in a fence. You can’t see the hole if you haven’t got the fence. What’s visible makes the invisible visible. Then I woke up.”

The exposition of the dream begins with the dreamer showing his position as an analyzed person and as a future Jungian practitioner, what is hinted at by the meditative posture (...“I was sitting cross-legged on the ground...”) evoking that of an *iogi*. To this adds also the sense of the statement “...in the central square of an ancient walled city.” A city, in dreams, stands for the myriad of meanings one can find in the existence of humans, and the central square represents the occupation of a privileged position to find out those meanings. This is the first manifestation of the archetype of the *Self* in the dream. Thereafter, the *Shadow* shows up in the scene, the “...young man full of life and vitality” who is described as an Apollo like figure, the golden hair a point in touch with the *Self* archetype that at times has been related to the gold metal. This *Shadow* (a dream character of unknown identity but of the same sex as the dreamer’s) reveals itself with a positive nature, somehow compensating the anxiety the dreamer shows before dreaming this dream. This has also been a possibility for the manifestation of the *Shadow* archetype because it does not

show itself exclusively under a noxious disguise. It is through the *Shadow* that the personality of the dreamer receives the dreams of third persons and has to interpret them, something still concealed in region partially unknown and not much exercised by the non-professional dreamer, and hence a source of anxiety for himself. But the subject interprets the dreams, and as he is forced to do the interpretation the enigmatic dream unfolds the *Shadow* archetype. As the interpretation proceeds “rocks, huge boulders, fell out of the sky and hit the dream, causing it to split” that disclosed “...an inner structure to the dream made up entirely of nuts and bolts”. Formerly, the sky was accepted as the residence of divinity, and rocks are supposed to have been the first material objects upon which Man projected divinity. We must evoke the dolmen or the cromlech; the stone that possesses a spirit quoted by Jung [5] (pp. 167, 170). Likewise there takes place a higher intervention in the dream that unveils something important and essential. This is, metaphorically speaking, the stance of analysis in psychotherapies. And what is revealed has been of an obvious complementarity: bolts and nuts that evoke the complementarity between the opposites, that is, the *complexio oppositorum* which characterizes the archetype of the *Self* following Jung [5] (pp. 225, 267), the ultimate source of meaning and of the compensatory function in the psyche, and that also stands for a reminiscence of the alternation and reciprocity between the opposites just as in Taoism, where they have been popularized under the names of *Yang* and *Yin*. Consequentially, a suggestion in this dream took place that the foundations of dreaming reside in a psychic process through which, in an abstract way, an interaction between opposites and contrasting determinants occurs, and this is a line of reasoning that agrees with the compensatory function of dreams in general that was indicated by Jung to cause the dream contents. This point of view has been corroborated by the sequence that follows: “...revealing an inner skeleton, which eventually took the form of a kind of abstract modern sculpture made of iron” that shows up as a development of the analysis, metaphorically speaking through the dream, with the abstract modern sculpture representing the intellectual conceptions of the dream world, of what has been essential to it (its inner skeleton) something that has been, so to speak, sculptured in its own way by modern Man with his science, on a scientific basis modernly. And this essential is made out of iron. Quoting Jung [5] (p. 246): “...metals grow from Gayomart’s blood” [the first man named as such]. This direction towards the origins points out to the hard nucleus, the permanent, in the life of humanity. Additionally, according to Chevalier and Gheerbrant [7] (p. 290) in the ancient mythraic tradition the neophyte, to reach a higher conscience, must symbolically climb up the steps of the ladder of the mystical ascension, and the fourth step is made out of iron and directs to Hermes. The step, as the fourth, is clearly associated with the numerology of the number four and hence with the archetype of the *Self* [5] (pp. 184, 252). On the other hand, the association of the element iron with Hermes has not been

strange to the Greek mythology of Hermes by means of which this divinity punctually associates with Ares, the martial divinity. Hermes in Greek mythology is also the messenger of the gods, and hence the psychopomp divinity *par excellence*. He is a tetramorphic divinity, and for this last reason connected to the *Self* archetype. Hermes lent his name to the branch of Philosophy called Hermeneutics, and the interpretation of dreams since it started as an historical record, has been nothing more nothing less than pure Hermeneutics applied to narratives of dreams. The symbolism for Hermes and for the element iron directs by the correspondence of the meanings associated with the symbols concerned and the contents of this particular dream under analysis, to the concept that this particular dream should be regarded as a significant message to the dreamer, and its source being what one has designated in Psychology for the latent part of the human mind, so called in order to avoid a prejudice when considering certain psychic facts. The source of the messages contained in dreams has been recognized by many, but not all, schools of Psychology, as being the unconscious part of the human mind. This perspective obviously rings a bell for those who already accept dreaming as a cognitive and affective valid thing. But for those still skeptical there is one possibility remaining: “I walked over and picked up a chunk that had been knocked off the dream. It was made of bread”, because in this it emerges as a metaphor that whatever we obtain after dream analysis and interpretation can certainly be food for thought, for the *Ego*. The conclusion to this part of the dream can be found in the speech: “I said to the young man, “This demonstrates how a dream must be interpreted. You must know what to discard. It’s just like life.” Here the dreamer dreams of the method of psychotherapy he was learning about in his real life. The art of dream analysis and interpretation consists of retaining what has been essential, of the relevant message inside the dream, but leaving behind much other information, and this has not been a conceptualization distant from the teachings of Psychoanalysis and Analytical Psychology. Then, a new change in the scene at the stage of the dream takes place and the pyramids make their apparition. The pyramid has been a symbol that Jung has exhaustively proved to be a representation of the archetype of the *Self* (*ibidem*, pp. 227, 231, 236). This is the ostensive intromission of the proto archetype into the dream. On the walls of the pyramid there are squares and triangles, all colored, and the colors change in a continuous play of interactions between the squares and the triangles colored. This is a manifestation in dreams, in a metaphorical way, for the compensatory function discovered by Jung, and suggested by the statement: “balancing of energy was what dreams were all about. They compensate psychic energy.” Once more, the dreamer dreams of the foundations of the Jungian analysis of dreams, one clear result from his ongoing studies. Hellas, there is an imperfection in the expression of the archetype that challenges the absolute affirmation of the conclusion just quoted, but that actually will be corrected by the end of the dream, in the *lysis*. The imperfection lay in the statement: “It

was as if this pyramid, about five feet high, was shingled on all sides with thousands of these small colored squares and triangles.” In a more general and abstract exposition, in dreams, the *Self* archetype expresses itself by the numerology of the number four. This was amply demonstrated by Jung (*ibidem*, pp. 225-226) and in the manifest dream there are triangles (a geometrical figure that lacks one side in relation to a four sided figure) and squares (in these the number four occurs in full compliance with the numerology of the symbols of the *Self*). Hence, there occurs a gap or lack of fullness in the triangles in this regard. The expressive gap suggests that the compensatory function of the *Self* should not be taken for granted as linearly as it is in the explanation given inside the dream. In fact, there are dreams without an apparent compensation underway but in which a symmetry or similarity between the conscious orientation of the dreamer and the message coming from the depths of the unconscious exists (the case of reductive dreams or negatively compensatory dreams). In other words, a parallelism in the senses offered by consciousness and the contents of the dream are obvious. While the manifestation in dreams of the *Self* archetype can be appreciated in full by the numerology of the number four, if the archetype makes use of an intermediate that lacks something regarding the fourth dimension (like in the geometrical shape of the triangle) it can be highlighting the importance of human potential to correct unilateral or biased attitudes on part of the dreamer, and by this way to regain the homeorretic process of individuation on the right path, avoiding one sided stances. This kind of biased position falling into the dreamer’s side is tentatively corrected by the end of the dream. At the end of the dream the pyramid changes its composition and becomes of excrement. In ancient times, the excrement ball was supposed to be rolled by the golden scarab that in the ancient Egyptian tradition was bound to the daily rhythm of the sun, to rebirth. The ball of excrement that was rolled by the scarab had the shape of a sphere and was equivalent to the sun. The sun, the sphere or the round ball have been symbols of the origin of life, of the manifest organizations, and these interpretations coincide in the myth of rebirth by the golden scarab both in the Egyptian and in the Chinese traditions [7] (p. 293).

Chevalier and Gheerbrant [7] (pp. 312-313) indicate that excrements, by themselves, are symbols of an assimilation principle, for what makes a synthesis between what has been assimilated and the one that assimilates, and of the ensuing biological strength gotten. Ritual coprophagia is the incorporation of this assimilation principle, the giving of vital force coming from the ritual, which the consumer aims. Thus, a pyramid made out of excrement could be a symbol of the archetype of the *Self* pointing out to its autopoietic functioning, of the rebirth of life day by day, and in which the assimilation of the *Ego* is realized by something that transcends it involving a psychic interplay of forces. The autopoiesis, and the assimilation that must be constantly associated with, lead the way to creativity, to the always new, to what transcends the past time of an individual and opens to

him/her the doors of freedom. This is the mode the *Self* operates, transforming each and every personality throughout a lifetime of individuation, be this individuation conscious or not. Consequentially, what can be inferred by the correspondences of meaning seen under the light of symbolism and concerning the *Self* archetype has been that beyond the *Self* as a source of compensatory function, this compensation must be sub-served to the individuation processes that the archetype commands. Then we have in the dream the invisible pyramid that is enantiomorphic to the first one. This calls our attention, visually, to the psychological phenomena of projection that has been ultimately operated by the archetype of the *Self*. The point of contact between the two pyramids it is in itself invisible, too (“...the tips of the two pyramids came together into a central point. But that apex was also invisible”). But in contradiction to this it is also visible in the dream (“Then the apex began to glow with an intense white light. It was strange looking into that space. There should have been something there, but there was only light”). This glowing point, between the two enantiomorphic pyramids, is the light where human conscience must focus its attention, whereby the phenomena of compensatory function yielded by the autopoiesis become clear, where the understanding through analysis of the projections and transferences associated with them constantly, present in dreams as well as in our daily awakened lives, is executed. In here, in the *lysis* of the dream, dwells the tentative resolution for the correction of the one sidedness stance that I mentioned in the foregoing, and that symbolically prolongs up to the end of the plot. Our dreamer is of Judaeo-Christian tradition culture and he invokes the power of God during the *lysis* to justify the transcendent art of dream analysis and interpretation, plus its effects upon the analyzed patients. The power of the hand of God and the supposition that one cannot face Him without dying are reminiscences from the Bible. New Testament versicles that illustrate allegorically His hand power, His light giving attributes, or His unknowable face, have been for example: Atos 4, 28; John I, 1, 5 and John I, 4, 12; Hebrews 11, 13; Solms 119, 173.

In the dream the saying: “The hand of God is in the shit” stands for subjection or compliance with a power complex, with the transcendent character of the autopoietic nature of dreaming that I mentioned. Carl Gustav Jung attributed this autopoiesis that I highlight in this paper, and the projections that are derived from it, to the putative structure of the collective unconscious of the psyche he named the archetype of the *Self*. Nevertheless, the planning of the *Self* for each and every individual remains unknown always, and the personal creativity joined by the process of autopoiesis filtered through the projections’ factor must be permanently managed by the individual’s freedom and by his/hers free will, all of these made conscious by the analytical endeavor. It has been by these means that the individuation endeavor works out, a process that surely has been more of a homeorretic than a homeostatic regulation. As a corollary of the whole dream the sentence: “What’s visible makes the

invisible visible. Then I woke up”, can be considered as the analogically coherent conclusion for the legitimate inference of the psychic reality of the existing latent part in the human mind, unveiled by dreams and that should be borne in mind after awake up.

3.3. Phenomenological Psychology and Dreams

Phenomenological Psychology basis its development upon the philosophical and metaphysical concept of Being that was proposed beforehand by Phenomenology, one line of philosophical enquiry that had its roots in Germany at the beginning of the twentieth century [8]. This metaphysical Being has been unknowable in its entirety and can be revealed only partially in individual beings, regardless of their living (like in Man and in animals) or inanimate natures. But among living beings only Man questions the problem of the Being after his own existence as a singular or individual being. This peculiar way of existence in Man regarding the Being has been called *Dasein*. *Dasein* shows a structure that has been derived from the Being, and this structure stands for what has been specifically human in human existence, so that it is not possible to recognize *a priori* any essence given to Man, but just an existential structure. Phenomenological Psychology studies what has been specifically human or the way of human existence, in other words, has been concerned with *Dasein*. Following, Medard Boss created his famous Daseinanalysis, a modality of the analysis of the human existence built upon Phenomenological Psychology. This school of Psychology states that the existence or *Dasein* is always structured, and without this structuring there can be no existence. In what consists of the structure of *Dasein*? What features does it display for its existence to be granted? Firstly, it has a Historical nature. Additionally, philosophers professing Phenomenology have been collecting a series of features to characterize their philosophy as time goes by. The first marked characteristic to be recognized was that *Dasein* has been bound to the world and to worldviews. Human beings are inextricable linked to the world where they live, inseparable from their own personal existence. There is no possibility for Man to become aloof from his world or from his personal existence. This condition has been named by Phenomenology as being-in-the-world. Being-in-the-world spreads through four dimensions, namely, the physical dimension (*umwelt*), the ideal or eidetic dimension (*uberwelt*), the social dimension (*mitwelt*) and, finally, the dominantly mental or proper dimension (*eigenwelt*). In Daseinanalysis to know one person is to know, among many other things, his/her world in the four dimensions quoted. Other typical features belonging to *Dasein*, to its structure, also called existential, are temporality (men are mortal and have one limited existence in time that cannot be opposed by human wishing), the spatiality (men live in a space-time that is restricted and its occupation has not been chosen by each individual before his/hers birth) and the corporal things or embodiment (they own their private bodies). The last existential is a mode of insertion into the world through a

personal body and leads to a specific view of the world. In the other hand, and still quoting the structure of *Dasein*, *Dasein* has been the producer of understanding and comprehension. There is no human existence or *Dasein* without understanding, and this understanding has been of an immediate character, not dependent on an elaborated and differed rational elaboration, postponed in time.

Another existential has been the affects (moods) or the dispositions from *Dasein*. Dispositions and understanding is co-original to *Dasein* and they have influenced the way other beings show up in the appreciation of the world at large. These other beings force one person to always become a being-with, that is, relationships have been constitutional to *Dasein*. And furthermore, one human being does not voluntarily choose his/hers own existence; he becomes of this world under the condition of thrownness or of a thrown being. Because Man has been a being-with and a being affected by thrownness, Man has been also confronted involuntarily with a network of pre-existing meanings that constitute facticity. The facticity of existence belongs to the past time and no one can change it. All the past is facticity and its denial constitutes what in Phenomenology has been named inauthenticity. Authenticity, in opposition, has been to have a reflective conscience of *Dasein* and, through it, to select authentic options. Because a person has been in a condition of thrownness this implicates from the onset that a person also becomes affected by decadence. By decadence we mean an *Ego* not functioning according to whatever is its true or proper nature, but following what others do, what is the usual thing to do, or according to what one is supposed to do. Decadence in its own way has been an aspect of *Dasein*. It corresponds to the impersonal that Martin Heidegger (1889-1976) named *Das Man*, and that in English should read “the They”. Reflection can limit the impersonal or decadence and make a person closer to his/her own self. Therapies suggested by Phenomenological Psychology (including the Daseinanalysis proposed by Medard Boss) make a reflection upon the impersonal and the inauthenticity in order to approach again, in a conscious way, the patient to what has been his/hers true self, to a personal project. To this end, therapies start by validating the patient’s experience, that is, to accept and recognize phenomena (for instance, ontic feelings of guilt, anguish or boredom) that affect the patient just as they plainly show up in his/hers phenomenological consciousness. Consequentially, initially there is a reinforcement of the patient’s experience and there is no attempt to alter the patient’s cognitions regarding the phenomena that upset him/her as has been the common practice in Psychoanalysis or in Cognitive Therapy. This stance derives from the recognition that being-in-the-world produces constantly the so called ontological debt based upon the fact that everyone has to make choices, and that the particular choices are supposed to be authentic, but they also leave behind other possibilities, unselected options. Choices can be markedly inauthentic if they go against facticity, but ontological debt, whatever the choices modality, permanently leaves a trace of guilt. Guilt is very important

from the existential point of view (ontological guilt) and from the point of view of the treatment of depression (ontic guilt). Ontological debt is owed to the condition of thrownness. Existential therapies, in accordance, face the future, direct the patient's attention to one specific personal project of the patient, accepting unconditionally the facticity of the past in the patient's previous history, but always searching for a reflective attitude in the elaboration of meanings in the patient's life.

For existential and phenomenological therapies, as is the case for other psychotherapy, dream analysis has been important and useful. Dreaming has been an expression of *Dasein*, and therefore its consideration has been legitimate. The very *Dasein* has always been in question in dreams. Additionally, because understanding or comprehension has been constitutional to *Dasein*, dream analysis and interpretation has been valid to it. But here, by interpretation we do not understand a causal explanation of a naturalistic character as Freud used to practice, but an interpretation of the meaning of the dreams, that is, a hermeneutical understanding of each dream. For this hermeneutical approach, claimed by Phenomenological Psychology, what has been valued has been the formal aspect of the dream rather than any symbolic contents. Thus, it is the manifest, formal, contents in the dream that has been considered for interpretative purposes. The formal aspect of the dream, then, must be its essence. Neither Phenomenological Psychology nor Daseinanalysis in particular do recognize the reality of a latent or unconscious part in the human mind because it does not appear in consciousness as such, as an apparent phenomenon in light of consciousness. So, the source of dreams and dreaming residing in the unconscious has been discarded by Phenomenological Psychology and the therapies that have been derived from it. Nevertheless, in Daseinanalysis the therapist has been supposed to know the dreamer and the context in which the dream takes place, but definitely there is the rejection of free associations as in Psychoanalysis because they do not make part of the dream phenomena as such, as data that manifests in the dreamer's mind in the immediate time of dreaming. The phenomenology of dreams for Phenomenological Psychology in general has been believed to be bound to the current life situation of the dreamer himself, to his/her existential of being-in-the-world, and it is in this direction that its hermeneutics goes. Hence, to realize in a dream the spatiality, the temporality, the embodiment of the dreamer, his/hers relations to alterity, the situational freedom of the dreamer, has been paramount to its hermeneutical interpretation of dreams. I can synthesize by saying that the world illuminates the dream and the dream illuminates the world of the dreamer in what can be faced as a hermeneutical circle. Under Phenomenological Psychology the four criteria employed by Phenomenological Philosophy for dream interpretation that have been the consideration of the phenomena as they show up in the consciousness of the observer (the rule of description), the phenomenological reduction (the rule of epoché), the horizontalization (the

equalization rule), and the eidetic variation or imaginative variation, are all scrupulously observed. Next, I transcribe and translate one example of a dream analyzed by Boss [9]:

"Last night I dreamed that in front of me a vast flat ground was spreading. It is almost twelve in the day. The sun is in its zenith and shines with strong intensity. Far away a hill rises. At its foot I discern, immediately, one group of beautiful girls; I see them very small because of the distance, but no detail escapes me. I desperately look for a pair of binoculars to see them better."

After the manifest contents of this dream and the formal aspect of the narrative in it Boss and her analyst colleague that supplied the case, concluded that the patient, a single thirty-four years old man undergoing existential therapy, suffers from "loneliness" and the "enormous distance that separated him from the beautiful girls" (*ibidem*). The manifest contents of the dream and the formal aspect, then, reflects the main thing of the dreamer's *Dasein*, namely, that he is a solitary man aloof from the intimacy of female companions. This same diagnosis could have been reached by the observation of the dreamer's life or by asking him, first hand *viva voce*, about these problems of his awakened living. The theory that was used to apprehend and interpret the data contained in the dream eventually revealed common sense, something after what can be derived from our daily experience as awakened persons; what counted towards the interpretation was the story told by the images in the dream, the actions belonging to the characters (both lines of reasoning highlight the phenomenological reduction under way). Nothing else but what is contained inside the dream's plot has been taken into account, besides the context of the dreamer (a single man in psychotherapy). The eidetic variation for the particular dream was reduced to the interpretation indicated; but the affective value of loneliness is relative regarding each one's wishes or desires, and henceforth the options offered by *Dasein* are also relative. One individual can be in a situation of loneliness because of fortuitous life circumstance, because of shyness, because of one life option that permits more free time regarding a professional career, one philosophical or mystical project, or by religious vow. In spite of this, the plot does not coincide factually with real life in the formal aspect. The plot can be taken more as a representation, or should I say a symbol, of the true life situation of the dreamer. So, the "loneliness" of the dreamer has been inferred aside the occurrence of feminine figures in the dream, and it is only the distance expressed towards them ("...I see them very small because of the distance...") and the imaginative use of the pair of binoculars to become near them (something we can only understand allegorically) that confirms the solitary nature of his social relations (maybe we are facing here a case of unconscious myxoscopia). Consequentially, in spite of the consideration that "Phenomenological understanding of dreams gives paramount importance to the facts" [9] one cannot avoid a certain interpretative symbolization in so far as symbols have been immanent in hermeneutical thinking.

For Boss [9]:

“In face of a phenomenological focused significant content, the analyst will ask the awakened analysand, if, in this state of awareness, more lucid, vast and open, he/she does not recognize, maybe for the first time, analogous significances between things and people of his dream world and his/hers own existence.”

In other words, can't *Dasein* unveil in an analogic manner, alternatively, for the dreamer in his/hers dreams? I personally fully agree. In this particular dream what is dreamed of in a phenomenological perspective has been the existential being-in-the-world in the social dimension.

4. Conclusion and its Short Defense

Dreams adapt themselves to the nature of the interpretative theory of the person who is going to analyze the dreams (the interpreter can analyze his/her own dreams as well as other people's dreams). In other words, patients under psychotherapy, in which their dreams are used for therapeutic purposes, spontaneously report dreams that fit selectively to the kind of theory their therapists will employ to figure out the meaning of the patient's dreams, and help them by means of the correct analysis and interpretation. Thus, one patient in Psychoanalysis will tell his psychoanalyst dreams that best enable Freudian interpretations. Patients in Jungian analysis will report dreams to their Jungian therapists that fit selectively the Jungian theory for dream analysis. Patients undergoing Daseinanalysis will show to their psychologists dreams in which the manifest contents and their formal aspects will have the possibility for an accurate phenomenological rendering. In this paper I have focused just three dreams that were interpreted by three independent methods that coincide with three largely accepted hermeneutical theories for dream interpretation and analysis. The dreams and the theories support the new conclusion, but the dreams concerned have been only three illustrative examples that nevertheless stand for a larger sample of other dreams, interspersed in the correspondent literature of the specific theories that actually confirm the conclusion put forward here. The justification for this phenomenon has been that dreams constantly concern the dreamer's life, something that has a consensus opinion among all those that interpret and analyze dreams from a hermeneutical point of view. Psychotherapy and the particularity of the relationship that develops between the patient, who has the status of someone hoping for a relieve of his/hers psychic suffering, and the therapist, who has the status of someone who has been supposed to help cure the patient ailments, makes the relationship a very important relationship, and hence something that the patient could dream of. Consequentially, dreams are going to become adjusted to the specificity of the psychotherapeutic doctrine employed to cure the patient, a therapeutic modality that will be obvious in its specific conditions as the treatment proceeds. I have reached this conclusion through a hermeneutical perspective but it is not an absolute novelty. In

2003 Prof. Dr. Michael Schredl quoted one study based upon the diaries of the dreams belonging to Freud and Jung in which 28 dreams from Freud himself are typically Freudian dreams, and in which 31 dreams by Jung are typically Jungian dreams. Additionally, another report showed that when comparing 120 dreams dreamt by four patients in Psychoanalysis and the same number of dreams from four other patients in Jungian analysis, the former dreamt mostly Freudian dreams whilst in the latter Jungian dreams were most common [10]. On the other hand, Professor J. Allan Hobson has been a subscriber of the conception that dreams are a random phenomenon, without any discernible sense as for the other theorizations that I explained in the foregoing of this paper. Hobson selected thirteen dreams from his own diary and subjected them to a comparative analysis with the hypothetical Freudian interpretation of them, and contrasting this interpretation with his own point of view that has been the biomedical stance that he considers valid [11]. He reached the conclusion that the Freudian interpretations are senseless, and that the biomedical randomness view has been the right one. A Freudian might say that the belief in the random nature of dreaming by the North-american psychiatrist Allan Hobson was self-confirmed in his own dreams. That is, the strong desire Allan Hobson has to impose within the academic and scientific circles his opinion, an opinion that has not been accepted by a legion of people that hold a different viewpoint, resulted in the satisfaction in dreams of his own way of seeing things because this way is affected by a frustrated intention, since the vision has not been universally recognized. Therefore, there are nothing but random occurrences in Hobson's dreams diary, dreams with a pure chance drift that corroborate his views about the world of dreams (one should notice that this self-confirmation has been, at the same time, one self-justification for his *a priori* attitude, an attitude that even has the nature of its object subscribed by his peers). The random theory for the meaninglessness of the dreams convincingly assumed by Hobson ended up by moulding his own dreams into a peculiar shape, so that he can interpret them following his anticipated expectancies. One Jungian interpretation for the whole situation might fall into the class of reductive dreaming, displaying overcompensation in dreams directed to the past in Hobson's lifelong career. The case of the diary of the dreams of Allan Hobson, and of the known dreams dreamt by Freud and by Jung, all registered in writing, reinforce my fresh conclusion. But Hobson's stance on the randomness of dreaming did not preclude him of subsequently advancing one theory suggesting that "REM sleep may constitute a protoconscious state, providing a virtual model of the world that is of functional use to the development and maintenance of waking consciousness" [12]. Thus, the distinction between function and meaning that I underlined in the method's section of this paper must be kept in mind, to avoid the two conceptions mix up.

In brief, what has been the common denominator shared by the three hermeneutic theories? Raise the dreamer's consciousness (albeit this last one is in a dreaming condition)

to an alternative psychic reality in the life of the dreamer. This could be connected with wishes fulfilled in dreams (the past that was not a reality and that one does not know without any shadow of uncertainty that will become a reality in the future; Freudian and Adlerian perspectives), with what one is not aware of presently in relation to the past or in relation to the future in the life of the dreamer (Jungian compensatory function), or with the so called true or genuine choice among the options offered by *Dasein* (the being-there as a project of your own, proposed in the Daseinanalysis authored by Medard Boss).

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Schredl. Continuity in studying the continuity hypothesis of dreaming is needed. *International Journal of Dream Research*. Vol.5, 1-8, 2012.
- [2] S. Freud. *A Interpretação dos Sonhos*, Rio de Janeiro, Imago Editora, 1900/2001.
- [3] S. Freud. Fragment of an Analysis of a Case of Hysteria, In J. Strachey (Edt. and Trans.), *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud*, Vol. VII, London, Vintage and The Institute of
- Psycho-analysis., 1905/1925, pp. 7-122.
- [4] C.G. Jung. *Dreams*, London, Routledge, 1974/2002.
- [5] C.G. Jung. *Aion. Researches into the Phenomenology of the Self*, 2nd ed., London, Routledge, 1951/1991.
- [6] J. Chevalier, A. Gheerbrant. *Dicionário dos Símbolos. Mitos, Sonhos, Costumes, Gestos, Formas, Figuras, Cores, Números*, Lisboa, Editorial Teorema Lda., 1982/1994.
- [7] F. Boa. *The way of the dream. Conversations on Jungian dream interpretation with Marie-Louise von Franz*, Boston, Shambhala Publications, Inc., 1988/1994.
- [8] E. Spinelli. *The Interpreted World. An Introduction to Phenomenological Psychology*, 2nd ed., London, Sage Publications Lt., 2005.
- [9] M. Boss. *Sonhar e Psicoterapia. Revista da Associação Brasileira de Daseinsanalyse*, Vol.6, 5-20, 1980/1985.
- [10] M. Schredl. Continuity between waking and dreaming: a proposal for a mathematical model. *Sleep and Hypnosis*, Vol.5, 26-40, 2003.
- [11] J.A. Hobson. *13 dreams Freud never had: the new mind science*, New York, Pi Press, 2005.
- [12] J.A. Hobson. REM sleep and dreaming: towards a theory of protoconsciousness. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, Vol.10, 803-813, 2009.