GOLDSTEIN, JEFFREY, and PAUL McGHEE. 1972. *The Psychology of Humor*. New York: Academic Press.
HICKMAN, JOHN. 1962. Dimensions of a Complex Concept: A Method Exemplified. *Human Organization* 21:214-218.
KLAPP, ORRIN. 1950. The Fool as a Social Type. *American Journal of Sociology* 55:157-162.
McGHEE, PAUL. 1979. *Humor: Its Origin and Development*. San Francisco: Freeman.
MURDOCK, GEORGE. 1949. *Social Structure*. Toronto: Macmillan.
_____. 1971. Cross-Sex Patterns of Kin Behavior. *Ethnology* 10:359-368.
MURDOCK, GEORGE, and DOUGLAS WHITE. 1969. Standard Cross-Cultural Sample. *Ethnology* 8:329-369.
MURDOCK, GEORGE, and CATHERINE PROVOST. 1973. Measurement of Cultural Complexity. *Ethnology* 12:379-396.
O'DONNELL, WILLIAM JAMES. 1973. *The Sociology of Humor*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.
RADCLIFFE-BROWN, ALFRED R. 1940. On Joking Relationships. *Africa* 13:243-245.
ROBERTS, JOHN, MALCOLM ARTH, and ROBERT BUSH. 1959. Games in Culture. *American Anthropologist* 61:597-605.
ROBERTS, JOHN, and MICHAEL C. FORMAN. 1971. Riddles: Expressive Models of Interrogation. *Ethnology* 10:509-533.
SLATER, PHILIP. 1965. Culture, Sexuality and Narcissism: A Cross-Cultural Study. Mimeographed typescript, Brandeis University, Waltham, Massachusetts.
STEPHENS, WILLIAM. 1972. A Cross-Cultural Study of Modesty. *Behavior Science Notes* 7:1-28.

Pattern, Structure, and Style in Anthropological Studies of Dreams

BENJAMIN KILBORNE

Our life is twofold; Sleep hath its own world . . .
And dreams in their development have breath
And tears, and torture, and the touch of joy;
They leave a weight upon our wakening thoughts,
They take a weight from off our waking toils.

Lord Byron ("The Dream")

Byron's reflections upon dreams would seem to ring true universally. If indeed dreams do aid us in defining the twofold character of our

BENJAMIN KILBORNE is Visiting Associate Professor in the Department of Anthropology at the University of California, San Diego.

ETHOS 9:2 SUMMER 1981

0091-2131/81/020165-21$2.50/1

lives, and if deep feelings crisscross in and out of these two types of experience, then attempts to understand them would appear essential to the social sciences in general and to anthropology in particular. For is there not something quite human in the ways dreams link conscious and unconscious processes, bridge the gap between subjective experience and collective representations, and enclose secrets of the mind and memory?

Yet, anthropologists who have tried to study dreams[1] have commonly committed two errors: either they have related dreams to individual life histories, thus often implicitly or explicitly relegating them to the status of subjective, "private," nonsocial experience,[2] or they have viewed the dream as a grab bag of symbols, the meaning of which resides in their manifest content *and* in the observer's various classifications of "collective representations." The symbols thus obtained, although subjected to highly subtle interpretations, unfortunately shed virtually no light on the functions of the dreams of which they were a part. Such symbol-collecting may be an amusing exercise, but it is not very profitable.

Another difficulty for certain anthropologists (for whom notions of "objectivity" are used to avoid taking the trouble of defining what is *worth* explaining and why), is that dreams are not "observable." This is sometimes understood to mean that they are not "objective" (i.e., they are not behavior) and can therefore be excluded from the ranks of more dignified objects of "scientific" inquiry.

In this paper, for the reasons sketched very briefly above (and for others), I shall address the matter of dreams and anthropological research. Specifically, I shall focus on the work of J. S. Lincoln

[1] General studies are uneven in quality, the best probably being Lincoln (1935). Anthologies containing interesting papers include those of Woods (1947) and Von Grunebaum and Caillois (1967). Kimmins' (1920) book on children's dreams deserves mention, as does the short overview of D'Andrade (1961).

[2] What I am stressing here is not that anthropological studies such as those of Eggan (1952, 1961), Kluckhohn and Morgan (1951), Blau (1963), Lee (1958), or Honigmann (1961) are not valuable. Rather, I am seeking to demonstrate that when such studies rely on life histories, as Eggan's (1949) does on the "autobiography" of a Hopi, Don Talayesva, "by" Leo Simmons, such reliance obscures cultural definitions of the dreaming experience which may be more valuable for an understanding of the cultural functions of dreaming. In her paper on dream analysis, Dorothy Eggan (1961) addresses herself primarily to the use of dreams in personality research, rather than to questions of their cultural meanings and functions or to matters of how they can be studied to best advantage in the field. Exemplary studies include those of Hallowell (1967) and Wallace (1958).

(1935), whose *The Dream in Primitive Cultures* constitutes a "passage obligé" for all persons interested in the subject. The various problems, some of which Lincoln formulates, some of which he does not, attendant upon his attempt to marry dreams to culture patterns, a marriage which fostered "culture pattern dreams," will occupy the major part of this study.

DREAM PATTERNING

Perhaps the most clearly stereotyped dreams are divine, "message" dreams. One famous example of such a dream is that of the Pharaoh interpreted by Joseph (Genesis 41:15-57). In such dreams, the dreamer is a particular king while the message itself is impersonal. In fact, it may be because "message" dreams were believed to have been delivered to a royal figure by a deity, that they appear not so much as an individual experience as a message motivated by the wishes of gods to communicate. The King (Pharaoh) is "only" the agent; it is not really "his" dream. He is no more than the vehicle for the message. Or rather this is the way in which he is depicted. It is notable, however, that divinities tend to be rather selective, and not just anyone can have "message" dreams.

In Ancient Greece, for example, message dreams were highly stylized. A "tall man" habitually entered the room through the keyhole, planted himself at the head of the dreamer's bed and told him he was asleep. " 'You are asleep, son of Atreus' says the wicked dream in Iliad 2; 'You are asleep, Achilles,' says the ghost of Patroclus; 'You are asleep, Penelope,' says the 'shadowy' image in the Odyssey' " (Dodds 1951:105). At the end of the dream, the dream figure left the room as he had entered it—through the keyhole. This dream frame, a conventionalized narrative form used in Greek literature, expresses social attitudes toward, and perceptions of, the dreaming experience. Significantly, the very word *oneiros* in Homer most often means a dream figure, and not a symbolic structure (Dodds 1951:104). The Greeks did not speak of *having* a dream but invariably of *seeing* one. Furthermore, belief in the "objectivity" of the dream, in its independent existence "outside" the dreamer, is expressed in various forms. One of these is the "apport," a material token which dream figures leave behind them. Perhaps the best known such example is Bellerophon's incubation dream in Pindar.

Bellerophon awakens holding a golden bridle. Edelstein and Edelstein (1945) recount Epidaurian operation dreams which may be seen as variations on the same theme.

The dream "frame" is a striking example of what Dan Sperber (1974) has called the *mise entre guillemets* (bracketing or putting into quotation marks) of certain symbols. Such "cited" symbols are not the responsibility or creation of the person through whose dreams they appear. But, one might wonder, if "cited" dreams are most often "seen" by royal dreamers, is there not a connection between dreams and status? Does the dream message come from the god only, or can the dreamer have a hand in its making? How is a message dream a sign of divine selection, a "citation"? How can it be related to the dreamer's person and/or station?

One might also wonder what sort of relation exists between kingly message dreams, in which the message is sent from the gods and the dreamer clearly stays in bed (as in the Greek narrative frame), and dreams in which the soul wanders from the body and occasionally encounters divine spirits. The difference is significant not so much for interpretation of the particular dreams as perhaps for larger questions dealing with the character and representation of authority. It would appear that kingly message dreams are to be found in cultures where at least some degree of centralization exists: in the Ancient Near East, in Persia, in Greece, in Rome.[3] Among many North American Indian tribes, by contrast, significant dreams were most frequently "individualistic," soul guests: the soul wandered to the land of the ancestors or the gods and acquired special knowledge or skill there. In these examples, political structure and the organization of political authority have an effect on ways in which dreams are defined.

Whether the dream is patterned, "cited" and told by a royal figure to advisors or subjects, or whether it is patterned as an individual, shamanistic soul journey expressive of the wishes of the dreamer's soul and those of the ancestors, its "style"[4] is important.

Like all symbolic expressions, dreams are more than "symbolic";[5] one of the goals of this paper is to show how they function in specific cultural contexts.[6] From what has been said thus far, it should be clear that dreams are not isolates. Nor can they be approached as a strange collection of symbols without structure.[7] Indeed, styles of dreams reflect fundamental differences in the ways in which they function and are perceived. Let us examine now the matter of dream patterns in more detail.

[3] On Egyptian dream interpretation see Sauneron (1959) for an interesting account of beliefs and practices in Ancient Egypt. As Laufer (1931) pointed out in 1931, there exists a substantial tradition of dream interpretation, incubation and acts accomplished on the basis of dreams, and dreaming beliefs in Ancient China and Eastern Asia. Laufer makes the fascinating observation that to his knowledge only the Chinese have conventionalized pictoral representation of the dream. "From the head of the sleeper radiates a fluttering band or the dream-path in form of a lane on which are drawn or painted the figures appearing in the dreamer's vision" (1931:210).

LINCOLN'S CONCEPT OF THE "CULTURE PATTERN" DREAM

A student of C. G. Seligman, Jackson Stewart Lincoln was one of the first anthropologists to stress the social importance of the dream and its telling. In *The Dream in Primitive Cultures* (Lincoln 1935), he examined dreams of the Navaho, the Yuma, and the Menomini, as well as those of other North American tribes, and formulated the concept of the "culture pattern" dream. Lincoln's concept reworks

[4] Styles in dream telling and the narrative structure of dreams in literature (the use of dreams as literary devices) have been dealt with by, for example, Seafield (1865), Kelchner (1934), Ratcliff (1923), Dodds (1951), Oppenheim (1956, 1967), Devereux (1977).

[5] As the well-chosen title of a short but fine paper by Jones (1921) suggests ("Persons in Dreams Disguised as Themselves"), symbolism in dreams in highly complex. In his well-documented study of dream interpretation in the Ancient Near East, Oppenheim (1956) opposes "message" dreams to "symbolic" dreams, perhaps an unfortunate choice of terms.

[6] Rivers (1918), for example, remarks that the social counterpart of nightmares are revolutions. Beyond the spector of the French Revolution which since Burke has fascinated and terrified the English and provided fodder for British social thought, one can see in this statement a curious attempt to conceive of an analogy between the powers of the mind unleashed in nightmare and those of the populus unleashed in revolt. On nightmares see the classic work of Jones (1951) and the more recent study of Mack (1970). On more specific relationships between psychoneurotic symptoms and nightmares, see, for example, Lewin (1952), Fliess (1973), and Jones's fine paper (1911), "The relationship between dreams and psychoneurotic symptoms."

[7] Studies of dreams in series and of multiple dreams of the same individual considered together have often produced interesting material. Those of Roheim (1947), Alexander (1925), Kracke (1979), and Crapanzano (1975) are fine examples. The examination of Descartes's dreams by Lewin (1958) and Kubie's (1966) pertinent paper deserve particular attention, as does Grinstein's book (1968) on Sigmund Freud's dreams.

Malinowski's "official" dreams and for that reason, among others,[8] is a troublesome notion. Both "culture pattern" and "official" dreams are grounded in a dichotomy between individual dreams and "cultural" dreams. Lincoln defines the "individual" dream as "the unsought or spontaneous dream occurring in sleep," and the "culture pattern" dream as one of "special tribal significance" (1935:22-23). In this unsatisfactory definition Lincoln fails to distinguish between the dream in sleep and its telling, and overlooks the social setting of dream telling and dream interpretation. Furthermore, his definition classifies the dreams he recounts into one or the other of *his* categories, which simply do not correspond with the classificatory schemes of the societies he examines. Thus he does not address himself to matters of dream classification. Finally, just what he means by "of special tribal significance" or by "culture pattern" dream is not altogether clear.

In fact, putting Malinowski's and Lincoln's dream categories together, we have "official," "culture pattern" dreams recognized by the members of the culture on the one hand, and "free," "individual" dreams on the other. And in the opposition between individual freedom and official constraints we can distinguish preoccupations of twentieth-century Europeans. The problems underlying this classification were Lincoln's and Malinowski's but not necessarily those of the societies they observed.

In addition to the confusion over *whose* dream categories Lincoln is speaking about, there is a second source of confusion: "culture pattern" dreams are willfully sought, consciously provoked symbolic expressions of special tribal significance, while "individual" dreams are (conveniently) their opposite: "unsought dreams occurring in sleep."[9] It may seem more convincing to present "culture pattern"

[8] Seligman was apparently aware of the pitfalls, for he issued a request for material on type dreams (1923) from which, presumably, he intended to expand on the category. To the best of my knowledge he never did. See also Malinowski's (1927) *Sex and Repression*, chapter IV on "Dreams and Deeds." Both Malinowski and Lincoln had probably seen Seligman's request for materials (1923) and were familiar with Rivers's (1918) paper, "Dreams in Primitive Cultures," in addition to Rivers's unjustly neglected *Conflict and Dream* (1923).

[9] Lincoln may not have been altogether accurate in saying that "culture pattern" dreams are sought. Park (1934), in his paper on Paviotso shamanism, speaks of the acquisition of shamanistic powers in *unsought* dreams (infra, Rosie's dream). The question here rests on the functions of shamanistic dreams, the social position of the shamans, and the ways in which their initiation dreams helped them to achieve it. On the rather thorny matter of the status, personality, and functions of the shamans, there has been ample room for disagreement.

dreams as being sought, for their patterning would then be "more" conscious. But the matter of *how* dreams are patterned and how members of the society one is studying see these patterns as related to waking experiences designed to influence dreams, is quite another matter. Furthermore, one might well ask, then, what distinguishes dreams from visions and what is the meaning of the distinction in the culture one is studying?[10]

A third source of confusion lurking in Lincoln's concept is the implication of a necessary link between cultural material in dreams (culture "patterns" or symbols) and the coherence of the culture; in cultures suffering from antagonistic acculturation and unable to maintain their values and traditions, Lincoln believes, "cultural" dreams tend to be replaced by "individual" dreams.

These three points, culture and dream patterning, culture and sought dreams (intentional dreaming), and predominant dream types as a gauge of cultural coherence, will be taken up singly later on in this paper. First, we shall briefly look more closely at the material Lincoln uses in his book.

VISION QUESTS AND DREAMING THEMES

When he developed the concept of the culture pattern dream, Lincoln had in mind the vision quest of certain North American tribes. In his introductory chapter entitled, "Structure, Theory and Function of Dreams," the first example given is that of a Menomini culture pattern vision:

> After I had fasted eight days a tall man with a big red mouth appeared from the east. The solid earth bent under his steps as though it was a marsh. He said, "I have pity on you. You shall never live to see your own grey hairs, and those of your children. You shall never be in danger if you make yourself a war club such as I have and always carry it with you wherever you go. When you are in trouble, pray to me and offer me tobacco. Tobacco is what pleases me." When he had said this he vanished [Lincoln 1935:24-25].

Many Indian cultures in North America (e.g., those of the Plains, the Eastern Woodlands, the lower Colorado River, of Central California, and of the Northwest coast) believed in visitations of

[10] On dreams, charisma, and the role of dreams in religious (messianic) movements, see, for example, LaBarre (1967), Lanternari (1975), and D'Andrade (1961).

guardian spirits. These guardian spirits, who appear initially as the result of a vision quest or sought dream, grant individuals supernatural powers, guidance in war, hunting, lovemaking—in short in the major activities of life (see, for example, Benedict 1923). Often visitation dreams of this sort occur in adolescence and in men mark the transition from boyhood to manhood. Also, it is worth noting that socially significant dreams were generally dreamed by men.

> Where pattern dreams or visions occur, they are regarded as the determining factors in fitting the individual to take part in the life of the tribe. . . . Whether they are the myth dreams of the Yuma, or "career" visions of the Crow, or the guardian spirit dreams of the Woodlands or Northwest coast cultures, they are all regarded by the native as the most important experience in his life [Lincoln 1935:193].

As for "individual" dreams, these are an indication of individuals' adaptation to their culture.

> These kinds of dreams, therefore, can be regarded as the index or gauge of the individual in his relation with his culture. . . . The individual dream . . . represents the individual in his relation or non-relation to the culture, and its manifest content reflects his psychology first and secondarily his culture [1935:194].

In these comments, Lincoln tends to categorize dreams according to the discipline used to study them. Psychologists interested in deviance and personality study "individual" dreams; anthropologists study "culture pattern" dreams, because individual dreams reflect individual psychology and culture pattern dreams reflect the culture.

A number of interesting questions arise here: How are cultural and personal concerns related to the structure of dreams? To what extent is the structure "manifest" to other members of the dreamer's culture? What is the nature of knowledge (and belief in knowledge) obtained in dreams and how does the very conception of dreamed knowledge express conceptions of self and society?

CULTURE PATTERNS, STRUCTURE, AND INDIVIDUAL VARIATION

The Paviotso of Nevada believed that only through dreams was it possible to obtain the powers necessary to be a shaman. The following is one example of such Paviotso shamanistic dreams:

> When Rosie's father had been dead about eighteen years, she started to dream about him. She dreamed that he came to her and told her to be a shaman. Then a rattlesnake came to her in dreams and told her to get eagle feathers, white paint, wild tobacco. The snake gave her songs that she sings when she is curing. The snake appeared to her three or four times before she believed she would be a shaman. Now she dreams about the rattlesnake quite frequently and she learns new songs and is told how to cure sick people in this way [Park 1934:101].[11]

Rosie's dreams are examples of dream learning. In many North American Indian tribes (e.g., Crow, Blackfoot, Yuma, Seneca, Kwakiutl) songs, healing techniques, ceremonies, and ritual knowledge were dreamed. Dream learning is directly related to what Lincoln termed "culture pattern" dreams and focuses questions we raised earlier concerning beliefs in the nature of dreamed knowledge.

The Mohave believed in dreamed knowledge, which because it was dreamed was unchanging. One Mohave informant commented:

> Every shaman tells a different story of creation. One may hear it told in several ways, all stories related to the same event, but the way of telling it is different, as though different witnesses related it, remembering or forgetting different details. It is as though an Indian, a Negro and a Frenchman would tell it, or as though I, my husband, Hivsu: Typo:ma (Burnt raw) or you were describing a car accident we witnessed [Devereux 1957:1036].

It is interesting to consider this comment in the light of Mohave belief that shamanic dreams are never "new." Indeed, shamans cannot choose their calling: it is their destiny traced before they are born. Significantly, the Mohave believe that a shaman's power depends upon *prenatal* dreams. For the Mohave, at the moment of creation the souls of all future shamans lived with deities at the sacred mountain where the child god (Matavilya) conferred powers upon unborn souls. During their lives to come, these souls were destined to realize their powers in dream. Shamanic dreams were always "repeated," and believed to be the "same" as dreams had while in the womb and forgotten at birth. Speaking generally, the

---

[11] The importance of dreams in shamanistic initiation experiences, curing ceremonies, and in illness itself is thoroughly documented but relatively little studied. See, for example, Ducey (1979), Eliade (1951), Freeman (1967), Tofflemier and Luomala (1936), Dodds (1951), Edelstein and Edelstein (1945), Hamilton (1906), and Kilborne (1978).

purpose of nightly dreams was to refresh the dreamer's memory (Wallace 1947:253).

But, one might ask, what happens to dreams when their dreamers were rivals? As might be expected, shamans wanted their own differences validated and those of their competitors discounted. As Devereux (1957) has remarked, the differences in varying versions of myth or ritual fit into a pattern of the narcissism of small differences. Thus, great subjective importance is attached to divergencies between versions (1957:1042).

What is particularly striking about the Mohave example is the strength of the belief that nothing changes in the essential order of things. Dreams, being repetitions, represent changeless order *even* when they are used as the basis of individual ritual differences. That certain people be slightly mistaken when they tell their dreams is possible; there are inevitably slight omissions, alterations, or additions. But these variations do not call into question the function of dreams in reinforcing belief in the essential changelessness of Mohave culture. As Wallace (1947:252) noted, for the Mohave "all special abilities or funds of knowledge were to be had by dreaming and by dreaming alone." Indeed, when whites appeared with rifles, rifles were dreamed into the Mohave creation myth, as though they had been there (in the creation myth) all along (Devereux 1957).

Significantly, when Mohave shamans set out to cure an illness whose last healer had died before passing on the appropriate songs, they recited the myth instead. Thus, the power residing in a dreamed song did not necessarily depend upon literal "reproduction." Rather, in "symbolic" fashion it could refer to a myth which it was then seen to "stand for."

This raises the matter of remembering dreams. In certain instances, the songs or rituals dreamed are clearly too long to have been literally "dreamed." But, as I have stressed, my concern is above all the social definition of the dreaming experience rather than what might be termed the dream entity. For "remembering" dreams "right" obviously implies the acceptance by listeners of the pattern which a given dreamer's dream report is believed to exhibit. And this, in turn, depends upon the social position of the dreamer. For example, children who have heard dreams told by their father, a shaman, and who know that their father's position in the society is due to his dreams, may, after witnessing a curing ceremony, dream

that they themselves are called upon to exercise shamanistic powers. Rosie's dream cited earlier is one such example.

Thus the "remembering" of dreams is not strictly limited to the telling of the "actual" dream. That the Mohave do not discriminate verbally between dream and dream account drives the point home. Devereux (1957) convincingly argues that dreamed knowledge of a complex type is necessarily learned in waking life and then dreamed in condensed or "symbolic" form.[12] This dreamed allusion is then accepted and embroidered according to the myth pattern, either by dreamers or by their listeners or by both.

For Yuman tribes of the Gila River the dreaming experience was of fundamental importance, as it was for their neighbors the Mohave. "It was the one thing of which they constantly talked, the significant aspect of life as they saw it" (Spier 1933:236). Believing it to lie behind all success, the dreaming experience was their constant preoccupation. And being their constant preoccupation, they dreamed frequently and heeded their dreams.

Last Star put the matter thus: "Everyone who is prosperous or successful must have dreamed of something. It is not because he is a good worker that he is prosperous, but because he dreamed" (cited in Spier 1933:236). Songs, the conception of children, curing, bewitching, shamanic powers, clairvoyance, prowess in war, qualities of leadership necessary to be a chief or a leader in war—all these special abilities were to be obtained solely through dreams.

However, dreams did not automatically confer success. There was a saying that a handsome individual never dreamed of spirits. That, explained one informant, accounted for himself (he did not dream of spirits because he was so handsome) (Spier 1933:238).

If dreams conferred power on some, they did not confer it on all. Ordinarily, nobody but a dead chief's son dreamed the necessary oratorical powers to succeed his father. And fathers who had obtained "power" in dreams told their sons how they had come to see certain beings in dreams and how to go about seeing them.

---

[12] Allowance must be made for, on the one hand, condensation in the dream and, on the other, elaboration in its telling. One of the best known examples of a *perceived* difference in the time lapse of the dream and its narration is Maury's guillotine dream, recounted by Maury (1878) and cited by Freud (1900) in *The Interpretation of Dreams*.

Interestingly, "too much" dreaming was sometimes considered dangerous. In children it was a bad sign. Certain dreams which were "too powerful" (i.e., overwhelming) drove men to be *berdache* ("transvestites"). *Berdaches* renounced their manhood, dressed like women, and took on female roles and tasks. Particularly striking is one such dream reported for the Sioux:

> Among some tribes in this family of Indians, to dream of the moon is seen as a grave calamity. The man sees the moon having two hands, one holds a bow and arrow, the other the burden strap of a woman. The moon bids the dreamer take his choice. When the man reaches to take the bow, the hands suddenly cross and try to force the strap upon the man, who struggles to waken before he takes it, and he also tries to succeed in capturing the bow. In either event he escapes the penalty of the dream. Should he fail and become possessed of the strap, he is doomed to be like a woman [Lincoln 1935:88].

As was the case with this Sioux *berdache* dream, a typical Yuma dream involved a choice: The dreamer was obliged to accept the consequences of his dreamed actions. The Yuma dreamed of two mountains, one of which was the "berdache" mountain, the Sierra Estrella. These rival mountains appeared as young girls who earnestly set to gambling. If the Yuma mountain lost to the Sierra Estrella, then the Yuma lost a man; he became a *berdache* (Lincoln 1935:242).

Such stereotyped dreams express the cultural values associated with sexual roles: the dream ascribes the role of *berdache*. The Yuma believe that a child can only be conceived if a man has recently had a dream communicating potency to him. Likewise, the man knows instantly when he has achieved impregnation; he is filled with a sense of spiritual poise and power. Moreover, the woman can resist conception merely by refusing to *desire* a child. In addition to their relationship to the ascription or manipulation of chiefly powers, the choice of a career, and even confidence in one's powers to "remember," dreams are related to sex roles.

One informant, Joe Homer, a man in his mid-forties reputed as a singer, speaker, and funeral orator, was interviewed by Gifford concerning his dreams. When asked about his dreams of the sacred mountain, he commented that it was "too big a place to dream about more than once." And he added, "You would not go to Washington every year" (Gifford 1926:58). When a child, he was taken in a dream to the sacred mountain where he was introduced to the god

Kumastamxo. Since that time, he can deliberately set forth in his dreams and get to this god. "It takes four days to tell about Kwikumat and Kumastamxo. I am the only man who can tell it right. I was present at the very beginning and heard it all. I dreamed of it a little at a time" (Harrington 1908:327).

The dreamed songs of the Yuma tell what is going on in certain (often mythical) settings, or what took place there, or how the dreamer got there originally. The leitmotif of a soul journey through a semimythic, semireal landscape runs through Yuman dreams as well as those of other peoples.[13]

Limitations of space prevent my investigating the question of structural analysis of dreams here. Suffice it to say that structural analyses are most useful in the case of dreams in series, and not in the case of single dreams.[14] Also, the variations in narrative form and style of dreams have rarely been given much attention. Our primary focus here being an assessment of Lincoln's concept of culture pattern dreams and a brief overview of major features of the place of dreams among other cultural expressions, we must leave aside analyses of the dream's narrative structure.

Before concluding, let us consider dreams, commands, and wishes. Readers may have asked themselves how dreams can be obeyed and how obedience to dream directives is expressed. These are altogether pertinent matters to which we shall now turn.

DREAMS, DIRECTIVES, AND WISHES

Freud developed the thesis that dreams are wish fulfillments. In a

---

[13] See, for example, Eliade (1951), Ducey (1979), Gifford (1926), Opler (1959), Roheim (1947), Sebag (1964), Stanner (1956), and Wallace (1947).

[14] See note 7. As is well known, psychoanalytic analyses of dreams define symbolism in such a way that less emphasis is placed on the structure of the dream as told than on secondary associations and the role of what are seen to be symbols essential to the therapeutic process. Thus, the (overdetermined) functions of telling dreams in a psychoanalytic situation at a particular moment in the therapy are often seen to be, along with the timing of the interpretation, of greater significance than considerations of the dream's structure. A pertinent recent study is that of Kuper (1979), who applies structural analysis to the dreams of a "Wolf" Indian patient analyzed by Devereux (1951). In another context Devereux (1967) analyzes dreams of psychoanalysts who had recently seen a film on Australian subincision rites. Not only does he bring out similarities in reactions to the castration anxieties aroused by the film, but he stresses the psychoanalysts' denial of material expressed in their dreams.

fine paper, A. F. C. Wallace drew a parallel between Freud's theory and that of the Iroquois Indians for whom dreams express the wishes of the soul. "If, for instance, (the Iroquois) see a javelin in a dream, they try to get it; if they have dreamed that they gave a feast, they will give one on awakening, if they have the wherewithall; and so on with other things. And they call this Ondinok—a secret desire of the soul manifested by a dream" (Wallace 1958:236).

Obedience to dreams was not restricted to "good" dreams; nightmares and violent dreams were "obeyed" too. One man, after having dreamed that his cabin was on fire, was obsessed with its burning. The chief's council, after due deliberation, ceremoniously burned it down for him. In 1642 a Huron man dreamed that he was taken captive and burned. The council deliberated and decided that the catastrophe (defeat in war) must be averted. The dreamer was severely burned by professional torturers until at last he seized a dog, as a substitute victim, and offered it to the demon of war, "begging him to accept this semblance instead of reality" (Wallace 1958:239).

What strikes the reader of these seventeenth-century Jesuit accounts is not so much the socially recognized expressions of wishes in dreams as the acting-out of these wishes by *others*. The Iroquois belief in dreams as wishes of the soul provides an interesting counterpoint to Freudian dream theory, as well as perspective on obedience to dream directives. For the critical point is *whose* wishes are believed to be represented by the dream: those of the dreamer, those of the spirits, or both? This very ambiguity is used by the community to further socialize the dreaming experience. Dreams were not to be brooded over or used to incite individuals to act as individuals; they were to be *told*. It was for the listeners to act. The passivity of dreamers was reinforced, for they "only" dreamed; nonetheless, the wishes perceived in the dreams were granted. It is reported that one man who dreamed he ate human flesh was given a girl to be sacrificed. The man who dreamed his cabin burned down, had his cabin burned down for him.

Wallace rightly emphasizes the escape-value nature of dreams in Iroquois life. But it seems pertinent also to stress their importance as positive contributions to the maintenance of cultural values. Even one's dream wishes are a social matter not to be kept to oneself (reinforcement of the importance of sharing), because the importance of

dream wishes extends far beyond the dreamer.[15] In fact, the realization of dream wishes by other members of the community can be seen as a part of the dreaming experience. The passive dreamer provides the blueprint for action which *others* execute. For one obeys not only the known dreamers but also an unknown and superhuman power which speaks through them. Quite naturally such beliefs present us, European observers brought up in a tradition of individualism, with very real difficulties in grasping the Iroquois notion of "the person."

CONCLUDING REMARKS

From what has been said it appears that the dream does indeed possess pattern or structure in addition to style, and that it can function as a cultural representation like myth or ritual. However, the relations between the "structure" of a given dream and the "structure" of a given culture are extremely difficult to assess. To be sure, one can say that certain types of dreams exhibit culturally specific stress and ways of dealing with it (see, for instance, Opler [1959], Spiro [1965], Hallowell [1955], and Wallace [1958]). But such relationships do not seem to lend themselves to grand generalizations. Furthermore, when one speaks about the "pattern" or "structure" of a dream and the "pattern" or "structure" of a given culture, it is not sufficiently clear what is meant by the terms.

Lincoln's concept of the "culture pattern" dream has the merit of attracting attention to the cultural functions of dreams and provides a necessary point of departure. Nonetheless, the pitfalls in his approach are numerous. For one thing, the vagueness of the term tends to obscure the possibility that pattern may be in the eye of the beholder. To Lincoln, however, the pattern is "out there," conveniently organizing foreign material. From Lincoln's error we can

---

[15] Hallowell (1967) analyzes the functions of dream telling and the conscious *refusal* to tell significant dreams among the Ojibwa, relating both to their behavioral environment. Dream quests resulted in individual contact with guardian spirits who were believed to come to their assistance in times of trouble. As the Ojibwa depended largely upon hunting and as men were often isolated for long periods of time, belief in dreams helped reinforce individual self-reliance, provided strength to endure physical hardship and isolation, and also reinforced belief in the value of sharing what one did have.

draw at least one conclusion: studies of cultural conceptions of dreaming must take into account the classificatory schemes of the culture one is studying. Otherwise, dream categories are apt to correspond more closely to anthropologists' analytic categories than to the conceptual categories of the people they study.

Summing up schematically, I will suggest that:

(1) In Lincoln's book "patterning" designates comprehensibility and has little to do with function or cognitive orientation or world view. In Ancient Greece and in seventeenth-century Seneca society, forms of social organization were so basically different that there is virtually nothing in common between a "culture pattern" dream in Greece and one in Seneca society. In Ancient Greece, "message" dreams were related to structures and conceptions of royal political authority; these "message" dreams had name tags, so to speak (names figure in the dream narrative "frame"—"You are asleep son of Atreus"). Recipients of "message" dreams knew they were singled out and that such dreams did in fact confer authority. In Iroquois (Seneca) society, where there was no written, literary tradition, the dreamers were relatively unimportant; what mattered was the wishes their dreams represented. The obligation to do something fell not upon the dreamers, but rather upon members of their "entourage."

(2) Lincoln's concept and the material he examines is designed to demonstrate that dreams "effect" culture as cultures "effect" dreams, that dreams conform to "culture patterns" as certain culture patterns produce culture pattern dreams. One of the primary difficulties with this idea is that it implicitly portrays cultures as cookie cutters, stamping out assembly-line gingerbread dreams.

From our cursory analysis of individual variation in shamanic initiation and ritual dreams, it seems clear that there is ample leeway for individual variation in "stereotyped" dreams, if only to help perpetuate belief in the unchanging nature of dreamed material.[16]

[16] To be sure, the introduction of writing changes conceptions of permanence and repetition. Consequently, written tradition has profound effects on dream interpretation. For a discussion of salient differences between a male, written tradition and a female, oral tradition of dream interpretation see Kilborne (1978). Dream interpretation in oral traditions is relatively little known.

When the Mohave encountered rifles, they "dreamed" them into the creation myth.

Belief in the changelessness of what is dreamed is an important feature of the dreaming experience and not to be confused with mechanical, stereotyped replication. It would be helpful to have analyses of the functions and meanings of perceived repetition and variation in other narratives (tales, myths) and in the narrative structure of informants' accounts, in order to better understand the Mohave belief in the constant, eternal stock of knowledge, small portions of which are learned at a time. One thinks here of Roheim's (1945, 1952) discussions of Australian "dream time."

(3) The Iroquois example illustrates both the ambiguity of certain culturally oriented dreams, and the problems involved in speaking about intentionality in "culture pattern" dreams. From what has been said about sought dreams and vision quests it should be evident that problems of volition are very tacky. Difficulties are increased when one investigates the classificatory schemes in terms of which dreams are often perceived. How, one might ask, can intent be distinguished from wish in the vision quest of a Crow Indian, who, if he failed to dream after fasting for several days, went so far as to lop off a finger joint? There is obviously a point at which individual volition fails. Equally important, then, conceptions of individual deviance from expectable patterns of behavior (normal expectable environment) are an important feature of the dreaming experience. Both conceptions of individual deviance and the sense of power individuals derive from their dreams are part of the behavioral environment (to use Hallowell's expression). It is often misleading to divorce these multiple meanings and functions of dreams and of the dreaming experience.

(4) Finally, what sort of generalizations can be made about the relationships between certain kinds of (culture pattern) dreams and the degree of cultural stability and coherence?[17] As we noted earlier, Lincoln believed that "culture pattern" dreams, were reflections of simple, tribal societies. "Individual" dreams, by contrast, were indices of influences of other cultures and ethnic groups, of an-

[17] This is a question which has been addressed by LeVine (1966), Levy (1973), and Bastide (1967), but about which much remains to be written.

tagonistic acculturation and of the increasing solitude and isolation accompanying urban life in industrialized societies. Cultures in which "culture pattern" dreams predominate are "simple"; cultures in which "individual" dreams predominate are "complex."

Whatever the formulation of relationships between modern European society and "scientific" thought on the one hand, and simple, "primitive" communities and "pre-logical" thought on the other, it seems clearly important to scrutinize dreams far more than has been done up to now to better understand how the "ways in which primitives think" might be related to social organization and to account for salient differences between their thought processes and our own. Psychoanalytic theory, by underscoring the constants in human (fantasied) experience, provides us with good reasons for valuing dream reports and for studying ways in which members of given societies classify and interpret them. Anthropology urgently needs studies of myths, rituals, and tales and all symbolic forms of expression as they relate to dreams, dream classifications, and interpretation, and as these latter relate to them.[18] Not only can such studies illuminate cultural sources of stress and reactions (defenses) to stress, they can also inform us in essential ways about ~~conscious and their societies' [illegible]~~ personality and culture. ~~Moreover, and their societies and between personality and culture~~. Moreover, they can do so by enabling us to focus on articulations of belief and experience, cultural symbolism, and individual fantasies.

REFERENCES

ALEXANDER, FRANZ. 1925. Dreams in Pairs and Series. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis* 6:446-452.

BASTIDE, ROGER. 1967. The Sociology of the Dream. *The Dream and Human Societies* (G. E. Von Grunebaum, and R. Caillois, eds.), pp. 199-212. Berkeley: University of California Press.

BENEDICT, RUTH. 1923. *The Concept of the Guardian Spirit in North America.* Menasha, Wisconsin: The American Anthropological Association.

BLAU, HAROLD. 1963. Dream Guessing: A Comparative Analysis. *Ethnohistory* 10:223-249.

[18] Indeed, Roheim in his overview of psychoanalysis and anthropology in the first volume of *Psychoanalysis and the Social Sciences* (1947:33) spoke of the promise of studies correlating dream analysis with findings in folklore and anthropological field studies.

CRAPANZANO, VINCENT. 1975. Saints, Jnun and Dreams. *Psychiatry* 38: 145-159.

D'ANDRADE, ROY G. 1961. Anthropological Studies of Dreams. *Psychological Anthropology* (L. K. Hsu, ed.), pp. 308-332. Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey Press.

DEVEREUX, GEORGE. 1951. *Reality and Dream: The Psychotherapy of a Plains Indian.* New York: New York University Press.

_____. 1957. Dream Learning and Individual Ritual Differences in Mohave Shamanism. *American Anthropologist* 59:1036-1045.

_____. 1967. *From Anxiety to Method in the Behavioral Sciences.* The Hague and Paris: Mouton.

_____. 1977. *Dreams and Greek Tragedy.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

DODDS, E. R. 1951. *The Greeks and the Irrational.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

DUCEY, CHARLES P. 1979. The Shaman's Dream Journey. *The Psychoanalytic Study of Society* 8:71-117.

EDELSTEIN, EMMA, and LUDWIG EDELSTEIN. 1945. *Asclepius,* 2 vols. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

EGGAN, DOROTHY. 1949. The Significance of Dreams for Anthropological Research. *American Anthropologist* 51:177-198.

_____. 1952. The Manifest Content of Dreams: A Challenge to Social Science. *American Anthropologist* 54:469-485.

_____. 1961. Dream Analysis. *Studying Personality Cross-Culturally* (B. Kaplan, ed.), pp. 551-557. Evanston, Ill.: Row, Peterson.

ELIADE, MARCIA. 1951. *Le chamanisme et les techniques archaiques de l'extase.* Paris: Payot.

FLIESS, ROBERT. 1973. *Symbol, Dream and Psychosis.* Psychoanalytic Series, Vol. 3. New York: International Universities Press.

FREEMAN, DEREK. 1967. Shaman and Incubus. *The Psychoanalytic Study of Society* 4:315-343.

FREUD, SIGMUND. 1900. *The Interpretation of Dreams,* vols. 4, 5. Standard Editions. London: Hogarth and the Institute of Psycho-Analysis.

GIFFORD, E. W. 1926. Yuma Dreams and Omens. *Journal of American Folklore* 39:58-69.

GRINSTEIN, ALEXANDER. 1968. *On Sigmund Freud's Dreams.* Detroit: Wayne State University Press.

HALLOWELL, A. IRVING. 1955. Fear and Anxiety as Cultural and Individual Variables in a Primitive Society. *Culture and Experience,* pp. 250-265. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

_____. 1967. The Role of Dreams in Ojibwa Culture. *The Dream and Human Societies* (G. E. Von Grunebaum, and R. Caillois, eds.), pp. 267-292. Berkeley: University of California Press.

HAMILTON, MARY. 1906. *Incubation or the Cure of Diseases in Pagan Temples and Christian Churches.* St. Andrews: W. C. Henderson; London: Simpkin, Marshall, Hamilton, Kent.

HARRINGTON, JOHN PEABODY. 1924. A Yuma Account of Origin. *Journal of American Folklore* 21:324-348.

HONIGMANN, JOHN J. 1961. The Interpretation of Dreams in Anthropological Fieldwork: A Case Study. *Studying Personality Cross-Culturally* (B. Kaplan, ed.). Evanston, Ill.: Row, Peterson.

JONES, ERNEST. 1911. The Relationship Between Dreams and Psychoneurotic Symptoms. *Papers on Psycho-Analysis*. New York: William Wood.

_____. 1921. Persons in Dreams Disguised as Themselves. *Papers on Psycho-Analysis*. New York: William Wood.

_____. 1951. *On the Nightmare*, new ed., 1951. New York: Liveright.

KELCHNER, GEORGE D. 1934. *Dreams in Old Norse Literature and Their Affinities in Folklore*. London: Cambridge University Press.

KILBORNE, BENJAMIN. 1978. *Intérpretations du Rêve au Maroc*. Claix: La Pensée Sauvage.

KLUCKHOHN, CLYDE, and WILLIAM MORGAN. 1951. Some Notes on Navaho Dreams. *Psychoanalysis and Culture: Essays in Honor of Geza Roheim* (G. B. Wilbur, and W. Muensterburger, eds.), pp. 120-131. New York: Wiley.

KIMMINS, CHARLES W. 1920. *Children's Dreams*. London: Longman's and Green.

KRACKE, WAUD H. 1979. Dreaming in Kagwahiv: Dream Beliefs and Their Psychic Uses in an American Indian Culture. *The Psychoanalytic Study of Society* 8:119-171.

KUBIE, LAWRENCE. 1966. A Reconsideration of Thinking, the Dream Process and 'the Dream'. *Psychoanalytic Quarterly* 35:191-198.

KUPER, ADAM. 1979. The Structure of Dreams. *Man* 14:645-662.

LABARRE, WESTON. 1967. The Dream, Charisma and the Culture-Hero. *The Dream and Human Societies* (G. E. Grunebaum, and R. Caillois, eds.), pp. 229-236. Berkeley: University of California Press.

LANTERNARI, VITTORIO. 1975. Dreams as Charismatic Significants; Their Bearing on the Rise of New Religious Movements. *Psychological Anthropology* (T. R. Williams, ed.), pp. 221-236. Paris and the Hague: Mouton.

LAUFER, BERTOLD. 1931. Inspirational Dreams in Eastern Asia. *Journal of American Folklore* 44:208-216.

LEE, S. G. 1958. Social Influences on Zulu Dreaming. *Journal of Social Psychology* 47:265-283.

LeVINE, ROBERT A. 1966. *Dreams and Deeds: Achievement Motivation in Nigeria*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

LEVY, ROBERT I. 1973. *The Tahitians: Mind and Experience in the Society Islands*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

LEWIN, BERTRAM. 1952. Phobic Symptoms and Dream Interpretation. *Psychoanalytic Quarterly* 21:295-322.

_____. 1958. *Dreams and the Uses of Regression*. New York: International Universities Press.

LINCOLN, J. S. 1935. *The Dream in Primitive Cultures*. London: Cressett Press. New ed. 1970. Baltimore: Johnson Reprint Co. Page citations in text are from 1970 edition.

MACK, JOHN E. 1970. *Nightmares and Human Conflict*. Boston: Little, Brown.

MALINOWSKI, BRONISLAW. 1927. *Sex and Repression in Savage Societies*.

MAURY, L. F. ALFRED. 1878. *Le Sommeil et les Rêves*. Paris: Didier & Co.

OPLER, MARVIN K. 1959. Dream Analysis in Ute Indian Therapy. *Culture and Mental Health* (M. K. Opler, ed.). New York: Macmillan.

OPPENHEIM, A. LEO. 1956. The Interpretation of Dreams in the Ancient Near East. *American Philosophical Society Transactions* 46:178-373.

_____. 1967. Mantic Dreams in the Ancient Near East. *The Dream and Human Societies* (G. E. Von Grunebaum, and R. Caillois, eds.), pp. 341-350. Berkeley: University of California Press.

PARK, WILLARD Z. 1934. Paviotso Shamanism. *American Anthropologist* 36:99-103.

RATCLIFF, A. J. J. 1923. *A History of Dreams: A Brief Account of the Evolution of Dream Theories, with a Chapter on the Dream in Literature*. Boston: Small, Maynard.

RIVERS, W. H. R. 1918. Dreams in Primitive Cultures. *Bull John Ryland's Library* (Manchester) 4:3-28.

_____. 1923. *Conflict and Dream*. New York: Harcourt, Brace.

ROHEIM, GEZA. 1945. *The Eternal Ones of the Dream*. New York: International Universities Press.

_____. 1947. Psychoanalysis and Anthropology. *Psychoanalysis and the Social Sciences* 1:9-33.

_____. 1952. *The Gates of the Dream*. New York: International Universities Press.

SAUNERON, SERGE. 1959. Les Songes et Leur Interpretation dans l'Egypte Ancienne. *Sources Orientales*, vol. II. Paris: Editions du Seuil.

SEAFIELD, F. 1865. *Literature and Curiosities of Dreams*. London: Chapman and Hall.

SEBAG, LUCIEN. 1964. Analyse des Rêves d'une Indienne Guayak. *Les Temps Modernes* 19:2181-2237.

SELIGMAN, C. G. 1923. Type Dreams: A Request. *Folklore* 34:376-378.

SPERBER, DAN. 1974. *Le Symbolisme en General*. Paris: Hermann.

SPIER, LESLIE. 1933. *Yuman Tribes of the Gila River*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

SPIRO, MELFORD E. 1965. Religious Systems as Culturally Constituted Defense Mechanisms. *Context and Meaning in Cultural Anthropology* (M. E. Spiro, ed.), pp. 100-116. New York: Free Press.

STANNER, W. E. H. 1956. The Dreaming, an Australian World View. *Australian Signpost* (T. A. G. Hungerford, ed.). Melbourne. F. W. Cheshite Pty, Ltd.

TOFFLEMIER, GERTRUDE, and K. LUOMALA. 1936. Dreams and Dream Interpretations of the Diegueno Indians of Southern California. *Psychoanalytic Quarterly* 2:195-225.

Von GRUNEBAUM, G. D., and ROGER CAILLOIS. 1967. The Dream and Human Societies. Berkeley: University of California Press.

WALLACE, A. F. C. 1958. Dreams and the Wishes of the Soul. *American Anthropologist* 60:234-248.

WALLACE, W. J. 1947. The Dream in Mojave Life. *Journal of American Folklore* 60:252-258.

WOODS, RALPH L., ed. 1947. *The World of Dreams*. New York: Random House.