(for the Kleinian story can be seen as a version of Paradise Lost) of intra-uterine life.

Once the teleological components of Kleinian thought are discarded (we dream *in order* to preserve sleep; we think *in order* to compensate for the loss of the breast; we create art *in order* to make reparation), Segal's view is quite compatible with contemporary cognitive brain science. The idea that our precepts, choices, and actions are in part determined by basic assumptions and fantasies of which we are unaware is now widely accepted. Edelson, the neurophysiologist, might be quoting Klein when he says

> "every act of perception is an act of creativity"

for this is the idea that underlies the concept of projective identification. Conversely, when Segal states that

> "unconscious phantasies are a series of hypotheses which can be tested by reality"

she could be quoting from George Kelly.

The essence of dreaming is that it is *not* subject to reality testing: the brain is temporarily relieved of its duties of adaptation to the external environment. Segal views the dream as an attempt to synthesise a story out of the fragments of what has passed and what, except in memory, is therefore lost. This is one aspect of the overall process of "re-instatement of the lost object" whose physiological basis could be the installation of memory traces via metaphor, which she sees as central to emotional development. The function of the facilitating environment, whether parent or therapist, is to hold those fragments until they can be reassembled. The Kleinian dichotomy of paranoid-schizoid/depressive positions, if translated into catabolism/anabolism, fragmentation/assembly, or activation/synthesis points to fundamental psychophysiological processes without requiring any particular psychoanalytical articles of faith.

Segal is perhaps at her best in her discussion of the role of the biographer, whose work is of course ("of course") akin to that of the psychoanalyst as not-quite-an-artist. She quotes from Richard Holmes's *Footsteps* in which he recalls his youthful identification with Robert Louis Stevenson and his attempts to repeat his *Travels with a Donkey* in southern France. Holmes describes his idealisation and identification with Stevenson, and his disillusionment when he has to face the reality that his subject will always remain elusive, irredeemably separated by time, however much he inhabits the same places. But at this point a transformation occurs: he "becomes a biographer", begins to reconstruct, with the help of his imagination, his subject's life. A similar sequence of identification, disillusionment and reconstruction (or "imagine-dead-imagine" as Beckett put it) underlies the therapeutic process for both patient and analyst.

The same pattern is to be seen in dreams. The dreamer dreaming is identified with his dream. He wakes, with relief or disappointment: the boundaries of reality and phantasy are re-established and he realises it is 'only a dream'. But the dream work has been done, the past preserved, the metaphors made. With the help of the therapist, the dream can be made to do further work, should that be needed. Dangers lie in either idealising dreams, as do Mahrer and Stewart, or in dismissing them in the name of 'scientific' psychology. In psychiatry dreams are perhaps becoming, as Liam Hudson suggests, an endangered species. How many psychiatric trainees question their patients about their dreams, or routinely ask, as did the psychoanalyst Henri Rey. "What do you think about while you are asleep?"

Dreams reveal the basic meaning we attribute to the world, the architecture of our thought, before it is clothed with deceit or modified by reality, and so offer not perhaps a Royal Road, but an open window into the machinery of our thinking. The brain needs to dream: REM-deprivation leads to temporary madness. A society deprived of art withers. Both dreaming and art depend on metaphors – as States puts it,

> "metaphor is the dream-work of language, and the language of dream-work."

Perhaps both are necessary because they resonate with and reveal a fundamental property of our psychobiology. A psychiatry deprived of psychotherapy, and a psychotherapy which has lost all touch with neurobiology, will be similarly diminished.

MYTHOPHILIA

Joseph Redfearn

THIS BOOK IS an interdisciplinary effort to assess Jung's contribution to the interpretative methods of the humanities and the social sciences, and to place Jung in the light of contemporary thought on gender, creativity, and post-structuralist theory. The contributors, who include distinguished names such as Joseph Campbell, Robert Bly, James Hillman and Gilles Quispel, write from viewpoints both within and outside the traditional Jungian one.

C. J. Jung and the Humanities: Toward a Hermeneutics of Culture (Routledge, London, £25, 372 pp., 1990) is edited by Karin Barnaby and Pellegrino D'Aciernio. The book is a selection of essays and discussions from a conference in 1986 jointly sponsored by Hofstra University and the C. G. Jung Foundation of New York. Karin Barnaby has taught comparative literature at Hofstra University and is now at New York University. She has published an article on Schiller and Jung and is associate editor of *Quadrant*. Pellegrino D'Acierno is Associate Professor of Comparative Literature and Director of Italian studies at Hofstra University. He is the author or translator of several books on comparative literature.

https://doi.org/10.1192/S0007125000031937 Published online by Cambridge University Press

It might have been predicted that the large number of contributors would tend to polarise into two camps. On the one hand, one camp might argue that present-day post-modernist trends undermine the validity of the human being as subject, and that against this tendency, Jung stands out as one of the last great humanists. On the other hand, there are plenty of quotations available from Jung's writings which can justly be used to claim Jung as an early post-modern, post-structuralist, or so on. One would predict a similar polarisation among Freudians, Christian theologians, or, say, Marxist philosophers.

On the whole this collection is relatively free of Jungian zealotry, so that the polarisation I expected is not enough to be irritating. One contributor, for example, a "Hebrew of the Hebrews", an "unreconstructed monotheist", found Jung's "Answer to Job" "totally wrong-headed", and confessed to having great trouble in coming to terms with Jung's strange brand of "Christianoid polytheism". This same contributor again showed his lack of sycophancy by producing his own parochial definition of archetypes and arguing that archetypes are not universal but determined by the sex, the race, the class, and the generation of the group to whom a particular 'archetype' appeals. He instanced the "uniquely American myth" of "interethnic male bonding in the wilderness" in which he had taken particular interest (as an academic in English) and explained the peculiar present-day American social conditions responsible for the appeal of this "archetypal theme". Another contributor unkindly mentioned many other instances in literature and mythology, from the epic of Gilgamish and Enkidu of Sumerian mythology, onwards.

A potential reader might possibly hope that there would be some serious attempts to evaluate and assess the magnitude of Jung's impact on our culture, or on particular aspects of it such as literature and religion. There is little on this here, although there are numerous instances of Jung's influence on certain authors and even certain theologians. Most of the writers either describe how Jung influenced them personally in their work as writer, architect, sculptor, artist, or theologian, or else describe how he *should* influence writing, art, the study of religions, and culture generally. But an objective assessment of Jung's *actual* contribution and impact would be a study for a sociologist or an anthropologist and Jung is not yet completely citable in most of the vast and arid territory of academia (or 'Boasia' as one critic of modern sociology put it).

> "What is your myth?" has, we are told, become "What myth are you lived by?" To me this is particularly apposite, as it is clear that we are partly in the grip of the apocalyptic myth, the "last laugh of the Trickster God", the great Clown in the Sky who turns all our values upside down.

I liked most the section on creativity, which included contributions by the late mythophile Joseph Campbell and the oneirophilic James Hillman, whose charismatic presences have graced and laced many such a conference as the one upon which the book is based. Robert Bly, who hates universities and hates conferences, was nevertheless miraculously present. He made a serious contribution to the subject of creativity called "The Road to Mecca", enumerating the five companions the traveller on the road to creativity needs.

The section on architecture might perhaps have been the most interesting. It is clear that the design of buildings reflects the spirit of the times, that different shapes have different coenaesthetic 'feels' to them, and that at any one time therefore there should be obvious correlations between the archetypal characteristics of cultures and the architectural styles of different cultures and epochs. However, the one contributor who tried to make a beginning along these lines was very idiosyncratic and, partly because her slides could not be included in the book as examples of what she was referring to, not very intelligible. Other contributions about 'the temple' and 'the vessel' elements in architecture were not perhaps very original. It is clear that our notions of 'the feel' of our buildings and environment and their relationship to our body image, our self-concept, and our instincts and emotions are in a state of infancy, possibly because we live almost exclusively in our heads or, as planners, even above them. Yet the sales patter of up-market architects is full of claims that their designs are 'right' for the time.

The most useful section for me was that on post-modernism, being a pocket guide, not too dense, to the parallel progress of our ideas in literary criticism, depth psychology, art and philosophy during the last hundred years or so, from modernism, through new criticism, structuralism, post-structuralism to the twilight of the absoluteness of terms and the dissolution of the one interpretation.

I am very glad to have been given this book to review, as it is doubtful whether I would have afforded it myself. It is a book in my opinion for the better-off reader for whom Jungian exegetics can be largely taken for granted. Having said that I must say that I found many memorable gems in it and that I found it on the whole a very lively and stimulating though mixed package.

https://doi.org/10.1192/S0007125000031937 Published online by Cambridge University Press