Dreaming in focus: Cognitive and evolutionary perspectives on the functions and mechanisms of sleep cognition

Noah Garver

The Open University, Milton Keynes, Buckinghamshire, United Kingdom

Summary. This paper presents a unified theoretical account of dreaming that integrates cognitive, affective, and evolutionary perspectives. Drawing from neuroscience, psychology, and philosophy of mind, it proposes the Associative–Rehearsal & Reframing Model (ARRM), in which dreams arise from spontaneous neural activation selectively integrated into symbolic, autobiographical, and affective simulations. ARRM frames dreaming as a structured, adaptive process that facilitates memory abstraction, emotional integration, and creative problem-solving through associative expansion in the absence of executive inhibition. Contrary to views of dreams as epiphenomena, ARRM treats dreaming as an evolved, multifunctional simulation space—enhancing emotional resilience, cognitive flexibility, and adaptive foresight. The model is grounded in empirical findings and cross-disciplinary insights, and offers testable predictions for future research.

Keywords: Dreaming, Sleep Cognition, Dream Function, Evolutionary Psychology, Embodied Cognition

Introduction

Dreams occupy a curious place in human cognition. They are simultaneously strange and familiar, yet chaotic and meaningful. Dreams have inspired ancient myths, psychological theories, and neuroscientific research. This paper exists at the crossroads of evolutionary and cognitive perspectives on dreaming, integrating biological, evolutionary, and philosophical data. It argues that dreams are more than epiphenomenal: they have adaptive, emotional, and creative significance.

The paper is structured in five main parts. Section 1 reviews traditional and contemporary cognitive theories of dreaming, including cortical processing, activation-synthesis, memory consolidation, simulation theories, and newer models such as the Overfitted Brain Hypothesis. Section 2 explores the empirical landscape of neuroscientific studies on dreaming's mechanisms. Section 3 presents ARRM. Section 4 situates dreaming in an evolutionary context including relating to the existing integrative model NEXTUP. Section 5 offers a synthesis and implications for future research.

Section 1: Theoretical Foundations

1.1 Clarifying Dreaming vs. Sleeping

It is essential to this paper to distinguish between dreaming and sleeping. Windt (2015) provides a rigorous framework, defining dreaming as an immersive, hallucinatory form of conscious experience that occurs during sleep and is accessible only via subjective report. Dreams differ from sleep itself, which is a neural state that exists with differing neural activity than wakefulness, reduced response to external stimuli, and differing consciousness. While sleep is an important physical process that restores cognitive and physical function, dreaming is an internal state of consciousness that is a psychological experience. Dreams and sleeping should not be conflated. This is especially the case when discussing the utility and function of dreams, because the utility and function of sleep is well understood and documented.

Schredl (2018) also makes this distinction clear, emphasizing that not all sleep stages produce dreams, and not all dreams are tied to REM sleep. Empirical studies have shown that vivid dreams can occur during NREM sleep, particularly in late-stage cycles, further dissociating the processes of sleep from the experience of dreaming. This is an important conceptual distinction because the evaluation of the utility of dreams and sleep are precisely the matter at hand. To evaluate the purpose of dreaming specifically, one must investigate subjective reports, not just sleep architecture. This is because of the definition of dreaming vs sleeping in Windt, that the empirical analysis of dreams can only be done via subject report. This paper adopts this view.

1.2 Distinguishing "What" and "Why" Theories of Dreaming

A second important distinction is the difference between the evolutionary function of dreaming (why) and the content of dreaming (what)? Windt (2015) and Domhoff (2022) argue that many theories conflate these two levels. For instance, the continuity hypothesis describes what dreams are typically about; they mirror waking concerns and daily events (Schredl, 2018). In contrast, the threat simulation theory or memory consolidation frameworks propose why dreams might exist which suggests adaptive functions such as rehearsal for danger or long-term memory abstraction.

Failing to separate these explanatory levels can result in category errors: one cannot evaluate a theory's functional

Corresponding address:
Noah Garver, MSc Candidate, MSc Candidate, Edmonton, Canada.
Email: njgarver@gmail.com

Submitted for publication: August 2025
Accepted for publication: October 2025
Online first: October 27, 2025

utility (its "why") based solely on descriptive dream content (its "what"). A theory claiming that dreams simulate social scenarios must explain both the empirical prevalence of such content and its proposed benefit. This paper therefore evaluates each model not just for its observational accuracy but also for its explanatory scope and theoretical clarity.

1.3 Cognitive Models of Dreaming

Cognitive theories of dreaming emphasize continuity between wakeful and dreaming cognition. Domhoff (2022) defines dreams as intensified forms of mind-wandering. These are autobiographical, self-referential simulations of sorts with emotional salience. The continuity hypothesis (Schredl, 2018) supports this view, arguing that dreams reflect the same thematic concerns, memories, and emotions experienced during waking life. Windt (2015), from a philosophical standpoint, defines dreams as immersive, hallucinatory experiences in spatiotemporal environments, grounded in real cognitive structures even if they are not veridical.

The cortical processing theory (Antrobus, 1987; 1991) posits that dreaming reflects cortical activation patterns in the absence of external sensory input. This idea finds empirical support in EEG studies (Aserinsky & Kleitman, 1953) demonstrating high cortical arousal during REM sleep. However, dreams also occur in NREM sleep (Solms, 2000), challenging the equation of REM with dreaming and suggesting more distributed cognitive mechanisms.

1.4 Simulation and Predictive Models

Simulation-based theories represent a major class of explanations for the functions of dreaming. One of the most influential is the threat simulation theory (Revonsuo, 2000). This theory argues that dreaming evolved to allow offline rehearsal of threat responses. By simulating dangerous encounters during REM sleep, the brain primes adaptive behavioral strategies in a safe, low-cost environment. Dreams, on this account, would serve the same preparatory function as physical play in animals: they train neural systems to anticipate and react to danger.

This view was later expanded in the social simulation theory (Revonsuo, Tuominen, & Valli, 2015), which suggests that dreams primarily simulate social situations, including conflict resolution, coalition building, and emotional bonding. This model is grounded in evolutionary psychology and supported by empirical findings showing a high frequency of interpersonal content in dreams. Dreamed interactions usually feature friends, rivals, and emotionally relevant figures, indicating that the mind uses dreams to rehearse social cognition and emotional regulation. However, other explanations for familiar characters in dreams are similarly plausible.

Zadra and Stickgold (2021) offer a more general framework in their NEXTUP (Network Exploration to Understand Possibilities) theory. They argue that dreams help the brain explore weak associations across the memory network, enhancing the flexibility and integration of knowledge. Dreams, particularly in REM sleep, are marked by reduced norepinephrine and increased activation in associative cortices, creating optimal conditions for novel combinations and insight formation. Unlike threat simulation theory, NEXTUP is less teleological and more probabilistic: it treats dreaming as a mode of neural exploration that incidentally yields adaptive benefits through associative novelty.

Closely aligned with NEXTUP is Hoel's (2021) Overfitted Brain Hypothesis, which draws a parallel to machine learning. In artificial intelligence, overfitting occurs when a model becomes too attuned to training data and fails to generalize. Hoel suggests that REM dreams introduce noise and narrative strangeness to help the brain avoid overfitting to daily experiences. By presenting counterfactual or absurd scenarios, dreams challenge rigid memory patterns and promote cognitive generalization.

While simulation theories offer compelling narratives, their empirical support remains debated (Domhoff, 2022). For instance, threat simulation theory's focus on ancestral dangers is challenged by cross-cultural data showing many dreams involve mundane or positive scenarios (Schredl, 2018). Similarly, the high frequency of social content may reflect waking preoccupations (continuity hypothesis) rather than evolutionary rehearsal.

These simulation and predictive theories share a conceptual lineage in predictive coding and connectionist models of the brain. They frame dreaming as a kind of neural sandbox—less about practicing specific behaviors and more about stress-testing cognitive architectures, reducing bias, and improving model flexibility.

1.5 Emotion, Memory, and Embodied Theories

Dreaming is not merely about cognitive stimulation, it is deeply intertwined with the affective processes. The emotional regulation hypothesis posits that a dream serves to modulate and reorganize emotional memory, especially by blunting the salience of negative experiences. Neuroimaging data supports this claim. During REM sleep, limbic regions such as the amygdala are highly active, whereas prefrontal areas involved in cognitive control are suppressed (van der Helm et al., 2011). This neurochemical profile creates a state where emotion is vivid yet detached from the usual constraints of rationality.

Recent work by Sterpenich et al. (2020) found that individuals who experienced fear in dreams exhibited reduced amygdala responses to aversive stimuli during waking hours. This suggests that dreams may act as a kind of affective exposure therapy. Likewise, Scarpelli et al. (2019) have shown that dream content reflects waking emotional preoccupations, and that these are more likely to be resolved in REM dreams than NREM.

The feeling priming theory (Lemyre et al., 2023) takes this idea further, suggesting that dreams prime specific emotional tones that persist into waking consciousness. Rather than neutralizing negative emotion, this model argues that dreams tune the emotional system for upcoming challenges. Essentially this means adjusting the affective baseline for the day ahead. Empirical findings support the theory: positive dream affect predicts improved mood and resilience upon waking.

Expanding this view, Wagener (2023) proposes that dreams rehearse embodied interactions, reinforcing sensorimotor schemas for waking adaptability. This is a claim supported by evidence of physical 'practice' in dreams (e.g., Picard-Deland et al., 2021).

Complementing these affect-focused accounts is the embodied cognition theory of dreaming (Wagener, 2023). This model holds that dreams reflect whole-body simulations. These simulations are designed to prepare an organism for future interactions with their environment. Thus, dreams are not just about memory or emotion but about enacting selfworld relationships in a sensorimotor space. Wagener argues that dreams are serving as embodied training grounds for adaptive responses.

Together, these theories suggest that dreaming is not simply about remembering or imagining. It is about feeling and doing. Dreams rehearse action and emotion in tandem, fusing them into integrated scenarios that influence waking behavior and adaptation.

1.6 Conceptual Lineages of Dream Theories

Each theory of dreaming is grounded in a distinct conceptual lineage. Identifying the intellectual roots of these theories is essential to understanding their explanatory scope and limitations.

The activation-synthesis hypothesis (Hobson & McCarley, 1977) emerges from a neurophysiological reductionist tradition. Rooted in early sleep research and behavioral neuroscience, it explains dreaming as the byproduct of random brainstem activation during REM sleep. This model privileges bottom-up mechanisms, giving little credence to cognitive structure or symbolic meaning. While revised in later forms like the protoconsciousness theory (Hobson, 2009), it remains physiologically deterministic in outlook.

Memory consolidation theories, by contrast, are grounded in cognitive neuroscience, particularly in models of hippocampal-neocortical interaction. Theories like those advanced by Wamsley (2014) and Stickgold posit a purposeful role for sleep in reorganizing information. These theories emerge from connectionist and information-processing paradigms, viewing dreams as expressions of systems-level restructuring of declarative and procedural memory.

The threat simulation theory and social simulation theory (Revonsuo, 2000; Revonsuo et al., 2015) derive from evolutionary psychology. These models apply adaptive logic to dreaming, arguing that recurrent dream themes reflect ancestral problems—e.g., threat detection, social cohesion—that conferred fitness benefits. They take a functionalist, top-down perspective, interpreting dream content as evolved mental rehearsals.

The continuity hypothesis (Schredl, 2018), though widely accepted, is more descriptive than explanatory. It arises from empirical dream content analysis and cognitive diary methods. Its roots are in phenomenological psychology and content analysis, highlighting personal themes without positing functional purpose. It intersects with Domhoff's (2022) neurocognitive theory, which integrates the continuity hypothesis into a broader view of dreaming as intensified mind-wandering.

The Overfitted Brain Hypothesis (Hoel, 2021) and related models like Zadra and Stickgold's (2021) NEXTUP theory are anchored in predictive processing frameworks. These models conceptualize the brain as a Bayesian inference engine, constantly updating internal models to minimize prediction error. Dreams are thought to provide stochastic variation that prevents overfitting—analogous to noise injection in artificial neural networks. These theories borrow from computational neuroscience, AI, and machine learning.

The embodied cognition theory of dreaming (Wagener, 2023) draws on embodied and enactive cognition, proposing that dreams reflect bodily-situated simulations that prepare agents for waking action. Similarly, the feeling priming theory (Lemyre et al., 2023) connects dreaming with affective neuroscience and mood regulation, asserting that dreams prime emotional responses that linger into waking life. Both theories reflect a sensorimotor-emotional integrative tradition.

By mapping these theories onto their conceptual origins—neurophysiological, cognitive, evolutionary, predictive, and enactive—we better understand their scope, assumptions, and compatibility. This taxonomic clarity allows for targeted synthesis, and helps avoid the category confusion that often plagues interdisciplinary dreaming research.

Section 2: Empirical Foundations of Dream Cognition

2.1 Neural Correlates of Dreaming

Dreaming emerges from a distinct neural landscape that differs markedly from both waking consciousness and dreamless sleep. Functional neuroimaging studies have identified consistent patterns associated with dreaming, especially during REM sleep. The Default Mode Network (DMN)—comprising regions such as the medial prefrontal cortex, posterior cingulate cortex, and angular gyrus—is notably active during REM, reflecting the self-referential and narrative aspects of dreams (Domhoff, 2022; Vallat et al., 2020).

Meanwhile, executive control regions, particularly the dorsolateral prefrontal cortex, show marked deactivation. This functional dissociation helps explain why dreams lack critical thinking, logical coherence, and meta-awareness—key features associated with waking executive functions. This cognitive unbinding enables the symbolic, metaphorical, and affect-laden qualities that define dream mentation.

Solms (2000) challenged the REM-centric view of dreaming by showing that dreaming can occur during NREM sleep and that REM is not necessary for dream experience. Using lesion studies, Solms found that patients with damage to specific areas of the forebrain—particularly the ventromedial prefrontal cortex and temporoparietal junction—lost their ability to dream even when REM sleep remained intact. This decoupling supports a more distributed cortical model of dreaming, wherein conscious experience during sleep arises from integrative brain networks rather than REM per se.

2.2 Emotion, Memory, and Dream Recall

Neuroimaging research also highlights the role of emotion and memory circuits in dream production. The amygdala, hippocampus, and anterior cingulate cortex are all highly active during REM sleep (van der Helm et al., 2011). These regions are associated with emotional salience, autobiographical memory, and error monitoring—suggesting that dreams may integrate affective and mnemonic content in meaningful, if not always literal, ways.

Vallat et al. (2018, 2020) reported that individuals with higher dream recall frequency exhibit increased white matter density and functional connectivity in the medial prefrontal cortex and temporoparietal junction. These brain regions overlap with those involved in mental imagery, theory of mind, and episodic memory retrieval, supporting the view that dreams are constructed from personal memory, emotion, and simulation mechanisms.

Dream recall may also depend on neurochemical state. During REM sleep, norepinephrine and serotonin are at their lowest levels, while acetylcholine levels remain high. This neurochemical profile facilitates associative flexibility while impairing memory consolidation for the dream itself, explaining both the vividness and the forgettability of dreams.

2.3 Sleep Stages and Dream Content

Dreaming is not exclusive to REM sleep. While REM dreams are more vivid, bizarre, and emotionally intense, NREM dreams—particularly in stage N2 and late-stage N3—can still involve coherent narratives, realistic settings, and personal concerns (Scarpelli et al., 2019). The differences in dream quality may relate to variations in cortical activation, with REM supporting hyperassociative thought and NREM supporting more veridical and context-bound cognition.

This has important implications for dream theory. The activation-synthesis model originally emphasized REM mechanisms, but contemporary findings suggest that the key driver is not REM itself, but a certain profile of cortical activity—especially the relative dominance of internally generated signals over external sensory input, coupled with high limbic and low prefrontal activation.

2.4 Experimental Induction and Manipulation of Dream Content

Recent studies have shown that dream content can be experimentally manipulated through methods such as Targeted Memory Reactivation (TMR) and Targeted Dream Incubation (TDI). In TMR specifi c sensory cues (like sounds or smells) associated with a prior learning task are replayed during sleep. If the sleeper enters a receptive phase, these cues can bias dream content.

Picard-Deland et al. (2021) demonstrated that participants who experienced TMR-linked dreams showed enhanced performance on procedural learning tasks, suggesting that dreams can contribute to skill acquisition and offline rehearsal. Horowitz et al. (2023) extended this with TDI, where participants were primed to dream about a creative problem (e.g., inventing a story) and then exposed to auditory prompts as they drifted into sleep. Participants whose dreams reflected the prompts performed significantly better on creativity tasks the next day.

Horowitz et al. (2023) further demonstrated that targeted dream incubation (TDI) at sleep onset boosted creative problem-solving: participants who incorporated prompts into dreams showed 40% higher insight upon waking, supporting NEXTUP's associative exploration hypothesis.

These findings provide causal evidence for the functional role of dreaming in memory consolidation and creative cognition. They also validate the claims made by NEXTUP, Overfitted Brain, and emotional regulation theories: dream content is not arbitrary—it is malleable, directed by cognitive salience, and linked to measurable waking benefits.

2.5 Meta-Analyses and Broad Patterns

Hudachek and Wamsley (2023) conducted a meta-analysis of studies linking dream content to memory consolidation. They found a robust effect across studies: when dream reports included fragments or themes from a waking learning task, participants tended to retain or integrate that information more effectively. The strength of this association varied by task type, with the largest effects for visuospatial and creative reasoning tasks.

Scarpelli et al. (2022) reviewed over two decades of dream research and concluded that dreaming reflects a "state-dependent" reprocessing of emotion and memory. They emphasized that dream content is neither random nor fully determined by waking experience; instead, it reflects an interaction between cortical dynamics, individual disposition, and current concerns. This view reinforces the idea of dreaming as a flexible, adaptive, and meaning-laden cognitive process.

Section 3: Supporting Arguments and Theoretical Comparisons

3.1 Dreaming as a Cognitive Spandrel

As Springett (2019) cautions, inferring evolutionary functions from dream content risks 'just-so' storytelling. While simulation theories posit adaptive benefits, dreams may instead be exaptations—repurposing memory systems evolved for other functions.

Despite its apparent complexity, some researchers argue that dreaming is a cognitive spandrel—a non-selected byproduct of other evolved processes such as REM sleep, memory consolidation, or emotional regulation. Domhoff (2022), for instance, proposes that dreams are intensified forms of mind-wandering, emerging from the default mode network in the absence of external input. According to this view, the brain's intrinsic activity during sleep naturally produces narrative-like imagery, but this output is not itself selected for.

Critics of adaptationist accounts point out that dreaming leaves no physical trace, making it difficult to track through paleontological or genetic evidence. Furthermore, dreams are highly variable in content, often fantastical or illogical, raising questions about their reliability as rehearsal mechanisms. From this perspective, dreaming may be epiphenomenal—an emergent consequence of consciousness and cognition rather than a discrete evolutionary strategy.

3.2 Functional Dreaming Without Direct Selection

A middle-ground position acknowledges that dreams may be functionally beneficial without being the direct target of evolutionary selection. In this view, dreaming is a secondary product of systems that are themselves adaptations—such as sleep, memory consolidation, and emotion regulation. However, because dreams contribute to emotional processing, creativity, and social insight, they have been retained and elaborated by evolution.

This position is akin to the concept of exaptation—where a trait that evolved for one purpose is co-opted for another. For example, feathers originally evolved for thermoregulation but later enabled flight. Likewise, dreaming may have originated as a neural byproduct but acquired utility as a simulator of social and emotional scenarios. Over time, its presence may have conferred indirect advantages, reinforcing its place in the architecture of the sleeping mind.

3.3 Dream Content Across Cultures and Species

Cross-cultural studies reveal strong regularities in dream themes, particularly involving threat, social bonding, conflict, and achievement. Schredl's (2018) content analyses consistently find that interpersonal interactions and emotional concerns dominate dream reports, regardless of cultural background. This ubiquity supports the hypothesis that dream content reflects evolutionarily salient scenarios. Animal research also contributes to the evolutionary puzzle. Studies in mammals and birds have shown REM-like states and even behavioral enactment of dream sequences (e.g., rats replaying maze paths during sleep). These findings suggest that dream-like processing is not uniquely human and may have deep evolutionary roots. The presence of dream behavior in phylogenetically distant species supports the view that dreaming reflects a conserved cognitive function tied to memory and behavior.

3.4 Integrating Evolutionary Theory with Dream Mechanisms

Combining evolutionary theory with empirical mechanisms leads to a nuanced view of dreaming as a form of adaptive scaffolding. Dreaming may not be a discrete adaptation like the eye or the immune system, but it provides a platform for simulating possible futures, integrating conflicting emotions, and solving complex problems. In this sense, dreaming is a cognitive rehearsal space—especially when waking states are ill-suited for deep emotional experimentation or metaphorical recombination.

The symbolic logic of dreams, far from being arbitrary, enables safe exploration of emotionally charged or socially dangerous content. This symbolic capacity may not require direct selection for dreaming per se, but for general abilities like mental imagery, affective modeling, and scenario simulation—all of which dreaming embodies in potent form.

3.5 Conclusion: Evolutionary Roles Without Reductionism

Rather than choosing between adaptation and byproduct, a pluralistic approach best captures the role of dreaming in evolution. Dreams are likely emergent artifacts of systems selected for their cognitive and emotional utility. They are shaped by evolution, even if not the product of a single selective pressure.

This perspective respects the complexity of the dreaming mind without over-committing to speculative narratives. It also aligns with the modified activation-synthesis model developed in Section 3, where dreaming is understood as a hybrid product of neural activation.

Section 4: A Modified Activation-Synthesis Model

4.1 The Need for Integration

No single existing theory of dreaming adequately accounts for its full phenomenology or functional complexity. The **Associative–Rehearsal & Reframing Model (ARRM)** integrates insights from neurocognitive, simulation/predictive, and affective–embodied theories. While its activation premise draws from neurophysiological accounts, ARRM departs from the epiphenomenal stance by positing that dreams are functionally adaptive, shaped by autobiographical filtering, emotional salience, and symbolic recombination.

4.2 Core Principles of ARRM

ARRM holds that dreams originate in spontaneous neural activity during sleep, but this activation is neither random nor meaningless. Instead, the dream-generating brain selectively integrates emotionally significant, unresolved, or associative memory traces into narrative simulations. Limbic and default-mode activation is filtered through autobiographical networks, yielding outputs that are symbolically and emotionally coherent.

Three central features guide dream construction in ARRM:

1. Internally generated activation from limbic and default-mode systems provides the energy and narrative architecture of the dream.
2. Disinhibition of executive control—especially the dorsolateral prefrontal cortex—allows for metaphorical, symbolic, and nonlinear associations.
3. Selective synthesis is biased toward unresolved emotional material and salient recent memories, filtered through autobiographical significance and personal schema.

4.3 ARRM as a Post-Cursor to NEXTUP

The Associative–Rehearsal & Reframing Model (ARRM) is best understood not as a competitor to Zadra and Stickgold's NEXTUP framework, but as a post-cursor that develops and extends its insights. NEXTUP (Network Exploration to Understand Possibilities) emphasizes how dreaming facilitates associative expansion by allowing weakly connected memories to recombine under reduced executive control. This account highlights the generative flexibility of dreaming and its potential for novel insight.

ARRM builds directly on this foundation while insisting that dream cognition is not only exploratory but also **structured and selective**. Specifically, ARRM proposes that three additional processes shape the exploratory dynamics identified in NEXTUP:

1. **Symbolic Compression** – Dreams do not merely juxtapose weak associations, but compress them into metaphorical and narrative forms. These symbolic structures provide an economy of expression, allowing complex memory–affect constellations to be reorganized into manageable forms.
2. **Emotional Reframing** – While NEXTUP accounts for novelty, it does not specify how affect is reorganized. ARRM proposes that emotionally salient and unresolved material is preferentially selected for integration, with dream narratives serving as a reframing device that can soften, recontextualize, or transmute affective charge.
3. **Autobiographical Filtering** – ARRM emphasizes the bias of dream construction toward autobiographical salience. Rather than random exploration, dreams are drawn to unresolved conflicts, recent experiences, and enduring personal concerns.

Together, these refinements position ARRM as a second-generation account of associative dream cognition. Where NEXTUP describes the probabilistic exploration of weak connections, ARRM specifies how these explorations are structured, why they are emotionally consequential, and what mechanisms direct them toward autobiographical concerns. This post-cursor framing clarifies ARRM's theoretical contribution: it does not displace existing accounts but articulates the symbolic and affective architecture through which associative novelty acquires adaptive value.

4.4 Mechanism: Disinhibition and Associative Expansion

The deactivation of prefrontal regions during REM and late NREM sleep suspends executive oversight. This creates an associative environment in which ideas freely recombine across semantic, sensory, and emotional domains. The symbolic structure of the dream emerges from this loosened cognitive state.

4.5 Dreaming as Cognitive Reorganization

ARRM proposes that dreams function as a mechanism for cognitive reorganization, akin to neural network training with stochastic noise to prevent overfitting. Dreaming accomplishes this through:

- **Memory abstraction** – compressing multiple episodic traces into schematic or symbolic representations.
- **Emotional recontextualization** – revisiting and reframing affective experiences.
- **Insight incubation** – enabling novel solutions through non-linear reasoning and metaphorical processing.

4.6 Symbol, Superego, and Evolution

Drawing from Freudian and post-Freudian traditions, ARRM reinterprets the role of the superego in dream cognition. The superego is temporarily suspended during dreaming, allowing emotionally charged but previously censored material to surface—while symbolic structure preserves psychological safety and promotes cognitive novelty.

4.7 Theoretical Implications and Testable Predictions

ARRM not only integrates existing perspectives on dream cognition but also produces specific, testable predictions. Each of these predictions arises directly from its core mechanisms of symbolic compression, emotional reframing, and autobiographical filtering.

1. Metaphor density and creativity – Because ARRM frames dreaming as a process of symbolic compression, dreams that contain richer metaphorical structures should yield greater opportunities for novel connections and creative insight. Metaphors function as compressed mappings between disparate domains; their abundance in dreams predicts enhanced associative transfer to waking cognition.
2. Low coherence with high symbolic integration and problem-solving – The deactivation of executive control in dreaming suspends linear narrative logic, allowing associative expansion. However, ARRM proposes that symbolic integration preserves affective and autobiographical meaning within this loosened structure. Thus, dreams with lower narrative coherence but greater symbolic resonance should support flexible, non-linear problem-solving in waking life.
3. Priming unresolved emotional material and next-day outcomes – Emotional reframing is central to ARRM. Because dream synthesis preferentially recruits unresolved emotional material, experimentally priming such concerns before sleep should bias their appearance in dream content. When this material is recontextualized symbolically, waking affective outcomes should improve, consistent with ARRM's claim that dreaming reorganizes emotional charge.
4. Targeted memory reactivation and integrative performance – Finally, ARRM predicts that targeted cues introduced during sleep (e.g., TMR or incubation prompts) will not simply increase the model's emphasis on associative expansion under autobiographical filtering: external cues steer the selection process, but the dream's symbolic compression ensures that reactivated content becomes restructured and interconnected, yielding measurable gains in creative or problem-solving tasks.

By linking each prediction to the internal logic of the model, ARRM positions itself as an empirically tractable framework. These hypotheses are not speculative add-ons but necessary consequences of the model's core architecture.

Section 5: Critical Synthesis and Future Directions

5.1 Theoretical Convergence and Divergence

Across the diverse landscape of dream research, certain themes repeat: dreams are internally generated, shaped by memory and emotion, and often structured as simulations. Yet theories diverge in whether they see these qualities as functional or incidental. The **Associative–Rehearsal & Reframing Model (ARRM)** integrates the strongest elements from neurocognitive, simulation, predictive, and affective–embodied approaches, rejecting both the narrowness of single-function accounts and the passivity of epiphenomenalism. ARRM maintains that dreams are a hybrid product of spontaneous neural activation and top-down cognitive-emotional structuring, working in service of adaptation.

5.2 Symbolism and Narrative as Mechanisms

The symbolic logic of dreams is not an interpretive luxury but an active cognitive mechanism. Under ARRM, metaphor and narrative structure compress complex networks of memory, affect, and embodied schema into manageable, integrative forms. This symbolic compression allows emotionally charged material to be processed without overwhelming the dreamer, enabling safe rehearsal and reframing. In this light, dream symbolism is not a decorative by-product but the very language of adaptive cognitive work.

5.3 Methodological Priorities

Testing ARRM requires methods that capture both the neural and phenomenological dimensions of dreaming. This means linking high-density EEG/fMRI data to detailed, time-proximal dream reports, using computational tools to analyze symbolic density, emotional valence, and associative novelty. Portable sleep tech, targeted dream incubation, and neurophenomenology can help bridge the subjective-objective gap.

5.4 Clinical and Applied Implications

ARRM has direct implications for therapy, education, and creativity research. In clinical contexts, guided dream rescripting can exploit the reframing function to address trauma or maladaptive schemas. In skill learning and innovation, dream incubation can target the associative and rehearsal components to accelerate integration and mastery. Because ARRM views dreaming as a flexible, multifunctional system, its mechanisms can be adapted to diverse applied domains.

5.5 Toward a Unified Framework

Dreaming defies reduction to a single origin or purpose. ARRM offers a pluralistic framework: it acknowledges that dreams draw from ancient neural machinery, inherit functions from other adaptive systems, and yet have been shaped into a multifunctional space for associative expansion, emotional rehearsal, and cognitive reframing. By integrating symbolic logic with neuroscientific evidence and evolutionary reasoning, ARRM situates dreaming as a core component of human cognition.

5.6 Final Reflections

In ARRM's view, dreams are not idle reveries but nightly exercises in adaptation. They are structured, meaningful, and purposeful—an arena where the mind experiments with itself. Here, emotion and imagination meet in a symbolic grammar that transforms experience into readiness. Far from being a quirk of brain chemistry, dreaming is one of the mind's oldest strategies for learning how to live.

References

Antrobus, J. S. (1987). REM and NREM sleep reports: Comparison of word associates, implications for a cognitive theory of dreaming. In J. S. Antrobus & M. Bertini (Eds.), The neuropsychology of sleep and dreaming (pp. 165–192). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Antrobus, J. S. (1991). Dreaming: Could it be episodic, default network, or executive function? Consciousness and Cognition, 20(4), 1050–1054.

Aserinsky, E., & Kleitman, N. (1953). Regularly occurring periods of eye motility, and concomitant phenomena, during sleep. Science, 118(3062), 273–274.

Barrett, D. (2017). Dreams and creative problem-solving. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 1406(1), 64–67.

Domhoff, G. W. (2022). The neurocognitive theory of dreaming: The where, how, when, what, and why of dreams. Routledge.

Freud, S. (1900/1953). The interpretation of dreams (J. Strachey, Trans.). Basic Books. (Original work published 1900).

Hall, C., & Van de Castle, R. (1966). The content analysis of dreams. Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Hobson, J. A. (2009). REM sleep and dreaming: Towards a theory of protoconsciousness. Nature Reviews Neuroscience, 10(11), 803–813.

Hobson, J. A., & McCarley, R. W. (1977). The brain as a dream state generator: An activation-synthesis hypothesis of the dream process. American Journal of Psychiatry, 134(12), 1335–1348.

Hobson, J. A., Hong, C. C. H., & Friston, K. J. (2014). Virtual reality and consciousness inference in dreaming. Frontiers in Psychology, 5, 1133.

Hoel, E. (2021). The overfitted brain: Dreams evolved to assist generalization. Patterns, 2(6), 100244.

Horowitz, A. H., Esfahany, K., Gálvez, T. V., Maes, P., & Stickgold, R. (2023). Targeted dream incubation at sleep onset increases post-sleep creative performance. Scientific Reports, 13, 7319.

Hudachek, L., & Wamsley, E. J. (2023). A meta-analysis of the relation between dream content and memory consolidation. Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews, 149, 105185.

Koestler, A. (1964). The act of creation. Hutchinson.

Lemyre, A., Bastien, C., & Vallières, A. (2023). The feeling priming theory (FPT) of dreaming. Consciousness and Cognition, 118, 103424.

Picard-Deland, C., Aumont, T., Samson-Richer, A., Paquette, T., & Nielsen, T. (2021). Whole-body procedural learning benefits from targeted memory reactivation in REM sleep and task-related dreaming. Neurobiology of Learning and Memory, 181, 107442.

Revonsuo, A. (2000). The reinterpretation of dreams: An evolutionary hypothesis of the function of dreaming. Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 23(6), 877–901.

Revonsuo, A., Tuominen, J., & Valli, K. (2015). The simulation theories of dreaming: How to make theoretical progress in dream science. In T. Metzinger & J. M. Windt (Eds.), Open MIND (pp. 1–34). Frankfurt am Main: MIND Group.

Scarpelli, S., Bartolacci, C., D'Atri, A., Gorgoni, M., & De Gennaro, L. (2019). The functional role of dreaming in emotional processes. Frontiers in Psychology, 10, 1353.

Scarpelli, S., Alfonsi, V., & Gorgoni, M. (2022). The role of dreaming in emotional memory consolidation: A review. Sleep Medicine Reviews, 62, 101594.

Schredl, M. (2018). Researching dreams: The fundamentals. Palgrave Macmillan.

Solms, M. (2000). Dreaming and REM sleep are controlled by different brain mechanisms. Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 23(6), 843–850.

Solomonova, E. (2017). The embodied mind in sleep and dreaming: A theoretical framework and an empirical study of sleep, dreams and memory in meditators and controls (Doctoral dissertation). University of Montreal.

Springett, B. (2019). Can we know about the evolution of dreaming? Adaptive Behavior, 27(3), 157–165.

Stickgold, R., & Walker, M. P. (2013). Sleep-dependent memory triage: Evolving generalization through selective processing. Nature Neuroscience, 16(2), 139–145.

Vallat, R., Chatard, B., Blagrove, M., & Ruby, P. (2018). Characteristics of the memory sources of dreams: A new version of the content-matching paradigm to take mundane and remote memories into account. PLoS One, 13(10), e0205156.

Vallat, R., Chatard, B., Cassan, Q., Nicolas, A., & Ruby, P. (2020). Patterns of dream recall and dream content in narcoleptic patients. Clinical Neurophysiology, 131(1), 117–125.

van der Helm, E., Yao, J., Dutt, S., Rao, V., Saletin, J. M., & Walker, M. P. (2011). REM sleep depotentiates amygdala activity to previous emotional experiences. Current Biology, 21(23), 2029–2032.

Varela, F. J. (1996). Neurophenomenology: A methodological remedy for the hard problem. Journal of Consciousness Studies, 3(4), 330–349.

Wagener, A. E. (2023). The embodied cognition theory of dreaming: A proposal for how dreams prepare individuals for waking life. Dreaming, 33(1), 5–22.

Wamsley, E. J. (2014). Dreaming and offline memory consolidation. Current Neurology and Neuroscience Reports, 14(3), 433.

Wamsley, E. J. (2022). Constructive episodic simulation in dreams. Journal of Sleep Research, 31(2), e13537.

Windt, J. M. (2015). Dreaming: A conceptual framework for philosophy of mind and empirical research. MIT Press.

Zadra, A., & Stickgold, R. (2021). When brains dream: Exploring the science and mystery of sleep. Norton.