

UNITED WISDOM

A dream as material for reflection

Human Nature and Inner World

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

I37 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

A dream as material for reflection

Epigraph

> *following my fancies*

Zhuangzi, Chapter II, butterfly episode. Herbert A. Giles, 1889. A short fragment from the narrative, rather than a modern scientific explanation of dreaming.

What this article is about

In the morning, someone remembers a railway station, a wet suitcase, and the voice of an old acquaintance. That evening, the acquaintance sends a message. It is tempting to turn the coincidence into an answer: the dream was a warning, the connection is special, a journey is inevitable. Yet only three details remained in memory, while many more things happened during the day. How can we attend to the impression while retaining the possibility of being mistaken? This fictional scene introduces the article's question: a dream can prompt reflection, although its vividness does not by itself establish its origin, meaning, or future events.

We will consider several different activities that are easily given one name: reconstructing a memory, historical interpretation, research into dreaming, and personal work with an image. Each has its own question and boundary. Readers need not choose between compulsory decoding and abandoning their interest altogether. We can notice an experience, offer a cautious possibility, and check present circumstances separately. The suggested practice is editorial: a way to write down a question, rather than a treatment, validated diagnosis, or promise to uncover a hidden truth about another person.

I. Remember first, explain afterwards

The first thing available to us is the morning account of a dream. It may contain clear scenes, unclear transitions, and gaps. It helps to distinguish what someone now remembers from what they supply while trying to produce a coherent plot. If the memory contained a voice without a face, recording an acquaintance's name as an established participant already takes an additional step. It may seem natural, but remains an inference. This precision does not demand flawless memory. It is enough to leave room for the unknown in the record and avoid turning a convenient continuation into part of a confident recollection.

Suppose only the suitcase was wet in the first account, while rain appears in the second. Rain might really have been present and recalled later. It might have emerged as a plausible explanation. This sequence alone does not establish the cause. We can, however, retain two

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

dated records so that the later version is not confused with the first. This is an editorial way of handling our own account, rather than a conclusion about the mechanisms of memory. Its modest purpose is to make a change in the text visible before we build a large explanation of our life upon it.

The words we use to tell the story also add a frame. A narrow passage can be called a corridor, a trap, or the way home. These names raise different questions even when the scene described remains much the same. It can therefore help to record the available features first: two doors, dim light, an inability to turn around. Then, separately, the feeling of confinement and the thought of a trap. This does not prohibit expressive language. It makes it possible to see where a description became a reading and which other names remain available.

Not every dream needs preserving. We can keep a single detail, forget the rest, or leave the subject alone that morning. An unrecorded dream does not mean a compulsory message has been missed. When a personal interest turns into a demand to produce a meaningful plot every day, the material begins serving the demand. People are entitled to choose how much attention to give it. In our scene, recording the station, suitcase, and unidentified voice is enough. The day's events have not yet been written into the record retrospectively: this makes it possible to consider the coincidence rather than declare it a confirmation in advance.

II. The feeling is real; the explanation remains open

After waking, someone may remain upset with a person who refused to help in the dream. The feeling has a present fact of existence: I feel hurt now. But that fact does not prove that the real person refused or intends to refuse. This distinction matters particularly in relationships. If I begin a conversation by accusing someone of a dreamed action, I transfer an internal scene into shared reality without sufficient grounds. A more precise statement can acknowledge my own experience while leaving the other person their actual actions, words, and right to reply.

This does not make the feeling unreal. Discussing it does not require proving its cause first. We can say that anxiety appeared in the morning and consider which conversation is actually needed now. A request to talk and a claim about someone else's hidden intention nevertheless have different consequences. In the first case, a person proposes clarifying the circumstances together. In the second, they already know the answer on the other person's behalf. A dream may help someone notice a wish for closeness, but receives no authority to read another mind. This is an ethical boundary of our practice, rather than a theory of every nighttime experience.

Suppose someone dreams of being late for a meeting and feels ashamed in the morning. They can ask what real commitments they have today, whether an agreement has actually been broken, and whether anyone needs a message. If there is no meeting and no broken promise, shame need not become grounds for an apology. It remains an experience they can sit with or

discuss. If there is a real agreement, the calendar and correspondence can be checked. In either case, action is determined by the available circumstances rather than by the persuasiveness of the nighttime plot.

The explanation may remain unfinished. Sometimes a person notices their mood changing after breakfast; sometimes the image occupies them throughout the day. Neither possibility proves a dream profound or superficial by itself. Attending to an experience does not require a ranking of spiritual significance. It is better to ask what is happening now and how much involvement is appropriate. Perhaps a calm conversation is needed. Perhaps the person wants to draw the scene. Perhaps acknowledging an unpleasant morning and continuing ordinary activities is enough. The right to leave the interpretation without a final answer remains in each case.

III. A historical method is no universal key

In the selected opening of Chapter II of The Interpretation of Dreams, Freud discusses working with individual parts of an account and the person's associations. He also mentions writing down his own thoughts. A limited passage of A. A. Brill's 1913 English translation was read here, rather than the whole book. This is a historical author's description of a method; it does not provide contemporary proof of therapeutic effectiveness. Chapter II passage.

For our editorial purpose, the question about an image's context is interesting in its own right. If someone sees a staircase, we can first ask what they themselves connect with it today. Did it bring to mind school, building repairs, work, or yesterday's photograph? The answer need not reveal the dream's true cause. It shows a current connection in conversation. Even when it matches a biographical event, why the image appeared and what meaning to give it remain open. We use the question to clarify personal material, preserving a distance between an association, a historical theory, and an established explanation.

A dictionary of ready-made meanings offers a faster route: a bridge means transition, water means feeling, a house means the personality. That speed can appeal because it removes uncertainty. But for a particular person, a bridge might be a workplace, an unpleasant road junction, or the subject of a favorite drawing. Assigning it one meaning without a conversation replaces their material with a chosen system. A symbolic dictionary can be read as a cultural text, and its suggested connections considered. Grounds for a claim about a particular dream still have to be established separately; the existence of a printed table does not create them.

Nor should a personal association become a new compulsory dictionary. If water brought a holiday to mind today, the next dream involving water need not mean the same holiday. The circumstances, account, and chosen question can change. It is appropriate to record: I connected this detail with a journey just now. There is no need to write: I have discovered what

water means to me forever. This limitation makes the reasoning examinable at the level of our own record. It also allows us to acknowledge that an appealing connection was interesting without explaining the image's origin or obliging us to act in a particular way.

IV. The butterfly changes the question about certainty

In the final episode of Chapter II of Zhuangzi, the narrator wakes from a dream of being a butterfly and questions the boundary between the two states. We read Herbert A. Giles's 1889 translation; adjacent translator's explanations are not presented as the ancient text's words. This short narrative opens philosophical reflection on certainty and perspective, rather than a clinical description or proof that everyday life is unreal. Episode read.

In our own lives, we can use it to question a conclusion reached too quickly. What seems obvious now because I am looking from one state? How might the account change when further information becomes available? This is our contemporary reading, rather than a reconstruction of the whole Daoist teaching. It does not require rejecting a calendar, agreement, or another person's existence. On the contrary, acknowledging a limited perspective can prompt a search for further grounds before making an important claim. A dream leaves the impression of a complete world; after waking, someone gains a different context for considering it. The transition between descriptions is useful, rather than a compulsory victory for one beautiful metaphor.

There is also a limit to this use. If someone says that, since everything might be a dream, they need not answer for a promise, the philosophical image is doing something else: removing a specific responsibility. Doubt about the completeness of knowledge does not cancel the available fact of an agreement. We can be uncertain about the ultimate nature of experience and still check whether a promised document was sent. This editorial ethical position is not attributed to the ancient author. It is needed for a present conversation in which the image is discussed alongside the consequences of applying it to real participants and their ability to rely on one another.

Conversely, we should not demand philosophical doubt from another person simply because we liked the story. They may regard their dream as an amusing incident and have no wish to discuss the structure of reality. Participation remains voluntary. A comparison becomes meaningful when it helps raise an appropriate question, rather than enrolling the reader in a compulsory worldview. In our morning scene, allowing that the first version of the coincidence might change is enough. This does not require declaring the acquaintance an illusion or abandoning the simple check of when the message arrived.

V. Research into dreaming asks different questions

The abstract of Yuval Nir and Giulio Tononi's 2010 review connects research into experience with questions about brain activity, relations to the outside environment, and differences between imagery and perception. The abstract and bibliographic record were read; the full text was not read here. This is a review, rather than an experiment by the authors testing our recording exercise. PubMed.

For readers, the scale of the question matters. A researcher may ask how experience in dreams can be studied. Someone at breakfast may ask why a particular suitcase moved them. Even if the first question receives more data, the answer to the second does not appear automatically. A description of a process and a personal meaning can be connected in various ways, but are not the same statement. We should therefore avoid decorating our own interpretation with a scientific term when that term does not supply the particular evidence the interpretation requires. The name of a research field does not confirm an arbitrary story about today's message.

The reverse mistake is to expect a personal impression to resolve a research question by itself. Vividness, strangeness, or a sense of recognition may matter to someone. Yet these alone do not yield a general causal model for all dreaming. We can describe our own experience honestly and expressively without turning it into a research finding. This article does not assign sleep stages from a narrative, infer a brain state from a particular symbol, or assess health from its appearance. For our purpose, such claims would require other sources and a different verification procedure.

Separating the questions does not impoverish our interest. It allows several kinds of knowledge to remain alongside one another: what was experienced, how the person recounts it now, what they associate with it, and which research claims are actually available. If data for the last level are missing, that absence can be acknowledged without inventing a neurophysiological story. Sometimes this is the most substantive outcome of reading: a clearer understanding of which answer has not been obtained. The personal image remains material for reflection, scientific work keeps its own subject, and no promise arises between them that any selected source fails to make.

VI. One persuasive version is insufficient

Let us return to the station. First version: the dream is connected with wanting to leave. Second: the station recalls a recent meeting. Third: it is a convenient setting for a story about waiting. Fourth: its meaning remains unknown. We need not consider these equally plausible or list possibilities endlessly. It helps to see which present information supports the chosen connection and which information challenges it. If someone has been planning a journey for a long time, the first version becomes more understandable, but is not yet proved as the dream's cause. Biographical relevance and causal explanation remain different levels of claim.

We can ask a question that permits abandoning our favorite reading. What would I notice if the journey version were wrong? Perhaps the suitcase did not suggest travel until the acquaintance wrote. Perhaps the station was not named at all in the first record, which contained only a place of waiting. Such details do not prove another theory, but constrain the earlier certainty. For personal reflection, this is more useful than collecting only convenient coincidences. Here the check concerns the quality of our present reasoning; it does not become an experiment establishing the function of every nighttime image.

Sometimes two versions suit different activities. Travel may suggest a practical question about plans, while waiting suggests a literary scene for a story. We need not make them compete for one secret meaning if we do not claim to have solved the cause. Naming the activity matters: I am considering plans now, or I am writing a story. This helps avoid transferring freedom of artistic choice into a judgment about another person's intentions. In a creative work, an image can connect many associations. A real accusation or promise requires grounds that can be discussed with the participants.

There is a right to stop without an answer. Uncertainty becomes difficult when it is treated as a personal failure, as though an attentive person should understand everything they dream. Yet the task was voluntary and the material incomplete. We can leave the record open and return to it if interest or new information arises. We can also never return. Life's contents need not form a finished commentary on every image. In our scene, recognizing the coincidence as noticeable is enough, without immediately deciding who sent it or which compulsory road it indicates.

VII. A decision is checked in waking life

If someone wants to write to an old acquaintance after a dream, that action can be considered on its own terms. Is there a suitable occasion, what do I want to communicate, and does the person welcome this contact? A friendly greeting does not require proof that the dream predicted a meeting. We can acknowledge that the image reminded us of a connection and keep the initiative our own. The other person need not play the role of fulfilling a nighttime message. Their reply may be warm, brief, or absent; none of these automatically reveals the dream's meaning or cancels their freedom to choose involvement.

More consequential decisions require a different amount of evidence. Buying a ticket, leaving a job, or suspecting deception affects money, commitments, and relationships. It helps to check facts, available options, and consequences separately. A dream can indicate a question that had not previously been formulated. But it does not replace information about an agreement, route, conditions, or a participant's real actions. If the question concerns travel, considering the budget and timetable remains substantive work. The wet suitcase does not do that work for us, even when the image seems extraordinarily precise.

The distinction can be expressed without belittling the experience: this prompted me to think, and I am making the decision for these reasons. People retain authorship and need not declare themselves led by an inevitable sign. Such a position also permits a religious conversation if the participants actually want one. The article nevertheless does not determine what their beliefs should be. It proposes a visible boundary between personal interpretation and the grounds for joint action. Another person should be able to understand what is requested and respond to a request, rather than to a claim about their destiny.

Sometimes reflection leads to a small step: opening a calendar, clarifying a promise, looking at an old photograph. Sometimes it leads to no action. A step's size does not measure the dream's depth. A revised formulation, avoiding a hasty accusation, or acknowledging uncertainty can be a substantive result. In our morning scene, the message can be read according to its text and time of sending. This does not destroy our surprise at the coincidence. It brings the conversation back to what the person really wrote rather than assigning them a role from our own account.

VIII. An image can be kept for creative work

A dream is sometimes interesting as a scene, sound, or unusual combination of objects. This interest does not require a final psychological translation. The wet suitcase at a station can become a drawing, and the faceless voice the beginning of a story. Here an author chooses a form and need not claim to depict the experience's true cause. Rain can be added, the location changed, or a character invented if the result is honestly identified as a work of art. Freedom to rework differs from precision in the initial record: both are appropriate when the current activity and its requirements are clear.

Creative work also does not oblige us to treat every image as valuable. Sometimes it produces no wish to continue; sometimes it is too personal to publish. A note can remain unfinished, or something can be made just for oneself. Significance is not determined by likes, nor established by an unusual origin alone. If someone publishes a story, readers consider it as a story rather than receiving a duty to believe in the author's special reliability. The nighttime scene becomes part of a chosen form. Moving into art does not automatically turn it into evidence about a real acquaintance, their motives, or their secrets.

If people close to us are recognizable in the material, their involvement also deserves consideration. Being dreamed about does not make every detail common property. An author can change identifying features, leave the record private, or discuss future publication. This is an editorial ethical consideration, rather than a legal opinion on every work. The concrete question matters: will the account touch someone's private life or create the impression of a factual disclosure? A dream can be one person's internal event, while the published version becomes an external action with consequences for others.

Even in a private record, marking the mode can help. On one page: what I remember. On another: what I invented from it. Then a literary success need not, over time, replace the memory of the first account. No therapeutic effect is claimed for this separation; it supports clarity in authorship. We can preserve enjoyment of an image while declining to use the resulting plot as proof. The suitcase in the drawing is entitled to become red, enormous, and airborne. The suitcase in the record remains as the person remembered it, with its gaps marked.

IX. Someone else's dream requires permission to discuss it

When someone shares a dream, it helps to establish what they are offering the listener. Perhaps they simply want to tell an amusing scene. Perhaps they want to reflect together. Perhaps they have not decided how personal the conversation will be. Offering a confident interpretation before clarifying this means occupying a place that was not granted. A good question can be brief: would you like to discuss what you connect this with? A “no” ends that particular offer and does not demonstrate resistance to a hidden truth, immaturity, or insufficient trust.

If discussion is welcome, questions can concern the account itself and present associations without assigning a meaning from outside. Which detail is most noticeable now? What came to mind alongside it? Which question would the person like to consider? These questions guarantee no discovery and are not a psychotherapy protocol. They support a voluntary exchange in which the storyteller can correct the listener, change the subject, or decline to answer. An interesting version of the listener's own remains their version. It can be offered as a possibility without being presented as knowledge about someone or making agreement the price of respect.

Privacy also concerns storage. Forwarding someone else's record to a group chat or publishing it for an attractive interpretation should occur only within an agreed scope. The ability to copy a text does not create the storyteller's consent. If a digital tool participates in the conversation, someone can first remove names and details they do not want to share. This is no promise of complete anonymity or security in a particular service. It is a simple question about our own action: what exactly am I passing on, and why? Curiosity about an image does not make attention to another participant's boundaries optional.

The station, suitcase, and voice remain an open scene. We have not proved its origin and did not need to do so for limited reflection. We have instead distinguished memory, feeling, a version, historical reading, a research question, and an available action. The dream received attention without authority over a real acquaintance or a future decision. This outcome leaves room for surprise, creativity, and uncertainty. A person can return to the image or move on; both choices respect what was experienced when they clearly mark what is known, what is proposed, and what remains open.

What this means in practice

If you want to consider a dream, record a few details you actually remember. Mark gaps, later additions, and the feeling after waking. There is no need to reconstruct a complete plot at any cost. If you have already chosen an expressive name for the scene, keep the available features and your own name separately: this can make the point where an account became a reading visible.

Choose one present question. For example, what did a person, place, or object bring to mind? Record the connection as a possibility that arose just now. Leave another possible version or an honest “I do not know” beside it. Then ask what real information is needed if you intend to act. Does the dream support your interest in a question, or are you using it as the sole grounds for an important decision?

If the image concerns another person, base the conversation on their actual words and actions. You can describe your own experience without accusing them of a dreamed action. If someone tells you their dream, clarify whether they want discussion and preserve the possibility of refusal. Creative reworking can be pursued separately from the record of memory and identified as a work of art.

Ending without a solution is permissible. Consider whether the question has become more precise and whether a small, examinable step is needed today. If not, the record can remain open. This approach is not clinical help and promises no improvement in sleep or wellbeing; persistent sleep disturbance requires a separate approach that this article does not establish. In the initial scene, reading the real message, checking any existing agreements, and allowing the coincidence to remain interesting without a compulsory prediction is enough.

Key quotation

> *writing down my notions*

Sigmund Freud, The Interpretation of Dreams, Chapter II, fragment about his own recording within the selected methodological discussion. A. A. Brill, Macmillan, 1913, displayed line 691. This short fragment does not validate the effectiveness of the editorial practice offered here.

Connections between traditions

Comparison	Possible question	Boundary
Freud's selected methodological passage ↔ a present association	What does the person connect with an individual detail?	The historical method is not presented as contemporary validated treatment.
Zhuangzi II ↔ the storyteller's certainty	How does perspective affect a present conclusion?	A contemporary reading neither reconstructs the whole teaching nor proves life unreal.
Scientific review ↔ a personal account	Which research questions differ from the question about personal meaning?	The abstract was read, rather than the full review; experimental validation of our practice is not claimed.
A record ↔ artistic work	Where does memory become a chosen form?	A creative version is no proof about another person.
Experience ↔ joint action	What grounds today's conversation or decision?	A feeling does not establish someone else's action or a future event.

This is a limited editorial map, rather than a unified theory of dreaming or evidence of historical influence between sources. The opening scene and other everyday examples are fictional.

Primary sources

1. Sigmund Freud. The Interpretation of Dreams. A. A. Brill, authorized translation of the third edition, Macmillan, New York, 1913; Gutenberg No. 66048. Title metadata and the selected opening of Chapter II, displayed lines 664–697, were read; not the whole book or complete method. A historical author's description, without a contemporary effectiveness assessment.

2. Zhuangzi. Chuang Tzŭ: Mystic, Moralist, and Social Reformer. Herbert A. Giles, Bernard Quaritch, London, 1889; Gutenberg No. 59709. Header/title metadata, the butterfly episode at the end of II, and selected neighboring context were read. Translator's explanations are distinguished; not the entire work or Legge's translation.

3. Yuval Nir, Giulio Tononi. Dreaming and the brain: from phenomenology to neurophysiology. Trends in Cognitive Sciences 14(2), 88–100, 2010; DOI 10.1016/j.tics.2009.12.001. The complete abstract and bibliographic record were read; the full review was unavailable during verification. The laboratory record confirms the bibliography rather than replacing the article text.

International rights for the particular copies remain unestablished: UNKNOWN. Gutenberg advises checking local law; availability is not declared an international license. Direct fragments are limited through the shared ledger across all languages and files. Sujato/SuttaCentral and mirrors are excluded; complete source texts are not imported.

Tags

dreaming, sleep, memory, account, image, association, context, interpretation, Freud, A. A. Brill, Zhuangzi, Herbert Giles, butterfly, perspective, certainty, uncertainty, Yuval Nir, Giulio Tononi, scientific review, abstract, feeling, decision, coincidence, creativity, journal, privacy, consent, boundaries, primary source, UNKNOWN

About the authors

Andrey Zarinsh is the author and founder of United Wisdom. He explores inner transformation, the unity of traditions, intercultural dialogue, and contemporary spiritual discipline. Instagram: @andrey.zarinsh.

Maria Evilkut is a coauthor of United Wisdom. Alongside her research, she seeks to test these ideas in practice and observe how principles of unity and mutual understanding work in real life between people and cultures. Instagram: @ilkutki.