

LIMINAL ASPECTS OF DREAMS

Grigory Sergeevich Zaytsev*, Albina Akhatovna Bikbulatova*, Nadezhda Alekseevna Egorova*, Alexander Viktorovich Mozdykov and Dagmara Oyarona Kalashkova*

Abstract: The article studies from the standpoint of the methods of modern analytical psychology and philosophy of mind the problems of interaction between meaning and meaninglessness in dreams, as well as the ratio of meaning and value categories. The authors propose a hypothesis about the essential nature of dream, treating space of dream prior to its interpretation in the analysis as a space devoid of meaning – i.e., as an opportunity to escape from the modern discursive practices. On the basis of the hypotheses about the paradigmatic/discursive thinking (L. Althusser, T. Kuhn, M. Foucault), the group of authors offers their own methods of working with dreams: in everyday practical interpretation, and from the standpoint of a generalized view of the problems of dream and its relations with the world of wakefulness at large. The article provides not only an extensive study of the new hypothesis, but also practical examples from history and from modern life, giving a broad panorama of cultural and scientific context associated with this problem. As the basis of the research, more than a decade-long self-analysis of dreams (and theoretical conclusions from this self-analysis) of a famous Russian composer, philosopher and researcher of creative processes – Grigory Sergeevich Zaytsev is presented.

Keywords: Oneirocritics, psychology, dream analysis, meaning, discourse, values, worldview.

INTRODUCTION

This article deals with the nature of dreams, or to be more precise, the aspects of dreams which we have designated as the threshold or liminal – a term introduced by W. Turner (Turner, 1970), and widely used in psychology by M. Stein (Stein, 2009). However, what their specifics are we will consider later, because first we would like to present a small apology to the attempted research in the field of human dreams. Not being psychoanalysts, we ventured to penetrate into this area, not out of idle interest, but as a result of many years of study of the creative process nature – first of all, a composer’s creativity: on the example of creativity and self-analysis of own creativity and nature of dreams of a famous Russian composer, philosopher and researcher of creative processes – Grigory Sergeevich Zaytsev (Zaytsev, 2015). But the problem proved much more extensive, and went far beyond the purely artistic creativity that has made us more seriously get acquainted with the ways to interprets dreams by the contemporary scientific community experienced in that area, and how it can help us in the research. This urged us to see a set of texts, in one way or another connected with the interpretation of dreams, both historical (since the ancient Egypt era), and modern, up to works by living and practicing analysts. The classic fundamental works of S. Freud, C.G. Jung, M.L. von Franz

* Moscow State Institute of Music Named after A.G. Schnittke Russian Federation, 123060, Marshala Sokolovskogo Street, 10

and others did not pass by us. However, despite these sources, in fact, we will not analyze either these books or dreams of G.S. Zaitsev, wishing to reach a significant level of generalization and make a hypothesis concerning the essential nature of dreams, and imagine how on the basis of this hypothesis one can work with dreams in creative and everyday life.

METHODOLOGY

It is necessary to immediately specify that our approach is purely post-modern, and we are not going to offer any kind of a complete, coherent and comprehensive theory. Rather, our goal is to present dreams the way they have not yet been considered, just in addition to how the present science analyzes dreams, rather than as opposed to basic scientific concepts. We are not going to put the dream in the Procrustean bed of consistent theories. We are aware that in our opinion on this issue, there are certain contradictions (and we bear full and conscious responsibility for them), because there are so many contradictions in life, and even more in the object of our research – human dreams. In fact, conflicting theories are modern/current theories, i.e., those which do not claim to be the ultimate truth, as before creating a consistent concept, you need to be sure of the verifiability of such concepts, as well as of the method of verification. So we will not try to “outdo” K.F. Gödel or “play hide and seek”, turning a blind eye to the facts inconvenient for us and will look at the actual problem, that is, from the point of view of methodology, knowing that we are only at the methodological approach zone and speak about our view on the nature of dreams and not about what dreams are. The latter is unknown to anybody.

Scientific Methods to Interpret Dreams

In modern science, there are many concepts of dreams. So, in depth psychology the basic are considered two classical approaches, defined and described in the writings by Sigmund Freud and Carl Gustav Jung in the first half of the 20th century. These approaches are inherently not only different, but in many ways opposite:

- reduction of dreams, interpretation of “wish-fulfillment” in an attempt to avoid the “inner censor” as per Sigmund Freud (Freud, 2010);
- amplification, recovery of the inner integrity of dreams by engaging symbolic parallels to the archetypal image represented in dreams as per Carl Gustav Jung (Jung, 1974, 1997, 2007, 2014).

On the other side of the fence, there is a common domestic opinion about the meaninglessness of dreams, however, coexisting in people with wild superstitions, laid down in banal dream-books, dating back, apparently, over a thousand years... How to reconcile such conflicting views? Indeed, from a therapeutic point of view, both Freud’s and Jung’s approaches have proved to be effective. By the way, there are more modern models to work with dreams (Hall, 1983; Johnson, 1989; Hannah,

2003); great books by Marie-Louise von Franz, extending and complementing Jung's methodology (Franz, 1979, 1991, 1994, 1998); works by the archetypal psychology school (Hillman, 1998); works of the modern French school of psychoanalysis devoted to the problem of the unconscious (Lacan, 1977), as well as laboratory studies of the principles of the nervous system and brain functioning, being done in recent decades all over the world (Dennett, 1997; Metzinger, 2009). But, despite a great amount of scientific literature on the interpretation of dreams and their meanings, often dreams really do not mean anything, and even one of the classics of the scientific approach to the study of dreams Jung spoke of greater significance in the analysis of some specific (archetypal) dreams and lesser importance, if not insignificance, of other dreams, often simply filled with unprocessed fragments of memories of the passed day. So, do dreams make sense? Or maybe those are right who totally deny the meaning of dreams? After all, a dream can really be "meaningless", and often it really is, representing just images, flowing from the visual memory of what happened yesterday or in recent days, without any profound rethinking or immersion in a different reality. We will try to understand this, using the principle "proof by contradiction": not via the search for the meaning of dreams trying to find a starting point in identification of significant dreams and their separation from insignificant, but via the opposite attempt to identify what positive (scientifically) the concept of meaninglessness dreams can give us.

Introduction to the Problem

As a rule, people confuse two completely different categories: lack of meaning and lack of value. However, the absence of one does not imply the absence of the other, especially in solving the therapeutic tasks which, as a rule, are set by depth psychology. In most definitions, the word "meaning", including the classic ones by G. Frege and L. Wittgenstein (Carl, 1994), is linked with the context of the object in question, e.g., a modern understanding of the term "meaning" quoted from the New Philosophical Encyclopedia: "Meaning is the essence of the phenomenon in a broader context of reality..." (New Philosophical Encyclopedia, 2001). Based on the logic of the Russian language, the word "comprehension" is giving meaning to anything. To comprehend is to make sense of something. As a dream, prior to its comprehension (in analysis or self-analysis) is not comprehended by definition, it can indeed be regarded as a meaningless phenomenon, i.e., a phenomenon to which a meaning has not yet been set. What can such a view of dreams give us for our scientific research? In fact, very much. According to the works of Michel Foucault (Foucault, 1970, 2002), Thomas Kuhn (Kuhn, 1962) Slavoj Žižek (Žižek, 2004, 2006), Giorgio Agamben (Agamben, 2004), Louis Althusser (Althusser, 1969) and other famous philosophers of the recent time, our perception of reality is closely linked with the language field – or the discursive field in which we are located, and through which we comprehend the reality. Thus, the meaning as such, as an indirect

phenomenon, is possible only in the context of a particular episteme, a discursive formation or a scientific paradigm. On the one hand, such discursive formation as a coordinate system allows us to respond quickly to a typical situation, on the other hand, it is always associated with the concept of power and control over us: as a manifestation of the principle of restriction on freedom of vision. Discourse as per Michel Foucault is what was created from the set of signs, and any discourse is a kind of cell, its borders establishing the boundaries of the reality perceived and manifested with its help, as outside discursive practices an object, as an object of cognition, does not exist. That is, if you call a spade a spade, it turns out that our modern discursive formation invisibly dominates over us, our freedom to see something else, forcing us what and how to think. So, to think differently and about something else, we need a different discursive formation, which, however, will inevitably bring new limitations, and so on *ad infinitum*. Here we can recall the works of the great European thinkers: Jacques Derrida (Derrida, 1978, 1987) and Giorgio Agamben, who contemplated much on this topic – perhaps one of the most important topics for the current philosophical thought. By giving us the advantages of quick adaptation, the world concept or the episteme do not allow us to be the initiators of anything outside the causal logic of that episteme, or – as Slavoj Žižek likes to call it – ideology. And if it was that way (while the works devoted to paradigmatic or discursive human thought have a great evidence base, more than half a century of scientific history long), then we would find ourselves in a mechanistic model of the human world, where, as per the view of the New Age thinkers, people would be just cogs in the huge “cosmic clock”. The whole world would be turned into a machinery, a person would be completely determined by victorious blind Fate marching on crutches. A man in such a world would be completely subordinate: first, to causal relations of situations in the outside world, and second, to internal physiological constitution, originating in the DNA.

Hypotheses

Most modern scholars do not believe that the situation is so critical to the man and that the man does not rule anything in his destiny, except for some worshippers of strict and consistent science, so-called new behaviorism, like Daniel Dennett (Dennett, 1997) in the US and new cognitive science, like Thomas Metzinger (Metzinger, 2009) in Europe, in essence, even doubting the existence of the individual “I”. However, as we know from the works of Thomas Kuhn, paradigms (or epistemes as per Michel Foucault) historically follow each other, and discursive practices are distributed by particular areas, the loci of their application. Because of this, we would like to conclude that the man is still able to somehow affect the paradigm shift, as well as the choice of the most adaptive-applicable discursive practices since scientific revolutions occur and even the language evolves. But here arises a series of questions: how does the man get the opportunity to change

the paradigm as such (being constantly within this paradigm)? Where are the forces to make a scientific revolution, and why does the language itself evolve, not only scientific but also artistic, as well as common? Responses to these complex questions may be a few:

1. The paradigm has its own logic of existence and, relatively speaking, is “aging”, giving way to the new. The man in this view is more an observer than the actor. This concept could be called by D. Dennett’s term “Cartesian theater”.
2. Another answer to this question can be called dialectical: its essence is that paradigms/epistemes replace each other because of the movement of the scope of various discursive practices and their interpenetration. In this case, the man is also given very little space, since not individuals but the masses of people will act in the history of paradigms/epistemes development: their movement and their activities.
3. The third answer, in our opinion, is the most compelling, and, importantly, more humanistic. Its main provision will be that people occasionally have a direct perception of being, not conditioned by sense (that is, without ideology). And this vision of life is perceived through dreams – as reflections of this being as it is, outside the dominant episteme. This is what allows the man to gradually break the paradigm and shift to a new one, more adaptively fit.

Through the work of dreams a person is able to look at himself/herself without the methods of discursive practices, that is, outside the semantic paradigm – and see one’s own reality as it is, or at least see it in a different light, unlike the usual awareness... We believe that it is this liminal (threshold) nature of dreams, its border relation with the world outside the system of sense which created dreams a bad reputation in the scientific community (enough to remember ridicule by the scientific community of the first edition of “The interpretation of dreams” by Freud). After all, if this conflict is aggravated, it appears that dreams in some sense are opposite to “normal science” (Kuhn’s term) as the “normal science” is a manifestation of the paradigm itself. Thus, such a science is the representative of contextual mediated sense and a dream is a pure or nearly pure reflection of existence as such (and in terms of discursive formation – of non-existence) or, at least, of another existence in relation to the dominant episteme. Here, it is a good practice to recall one of the basic problems of philosophy throughout its history: the distinction between discursive, discrete thinking, advancing from word to word in the description of phenomena and intuition, embracing phenomenon all at once, without disintegrating it. The first is closest to the space of wakefulness, the second – to the space of dreams. This means that a dream, like a phenomenon, freed from the sense delivered from the episteme, gives us the opportunity to look under the “veil” of everyday reality, to

raise the cover of Isis/Matrix/Maya, and see the world in some other eyes, unhuman in some sense. After all, if the scientists are right in the assumption that a dream is a decrease in mental activity, we see dreams like advanced hominids (such as Neanderthals or Cro-Magnons) saw the reality off-dream.

Nature of Dream, Arguments and Counterarguments

Interesting is the fact that, as a rule, in a dream, we are really fully included in the reality of the dream – that is, we are not able to reflect it in dreams, to realize its strangeness, incoherence, etc., and when such a rare understanding occurs, dreams for us cease to be something essentially indistinguishable from our everyday reality. So, in most cases, in a dream we are getting integrated in some open (not capable of reflection) existence, like animals, according to studies by Jakob von Uexküll (Uexküll, 1928; Agamben, 2004). But such temporary loss of consciousness by the man in dreams is essentially different from the animal existence: first, by the fact that it is temporary only, and second, by the fact that this way we yet perceive the human, not the animal context of reality. We live within a human culture, and every day we are in the world of people, even if we are far from the people themselves for hundreds of kilometers, being representatives of mankind as such and by introjection mankind is always invisibly present in us. Yet, is our concept of dream meaninglessness true? For dreams have been analyzed by psychologists for many years and such studies have repeatedly witnessed the therapeutic effect. Moreover, Jungian analysts may remind that there is a phenomenon of synchronicity, as well as a certain proportionality of both past and future to dreams of a patient. How to resolve this contradiction with the idea of dream meaninglessness? Or is this contradiction only seeming? The fact is that almost always, when we begin to remember a dream after waking up, it is rationalized, descriptively recalled, included in the discursive practice, in the worldview concept. Often, a well-remembered dream, especially if it belongs to the group of those dreams that Jung called archetypal, is a completely different reality than the reality of the everyday world around us. Because of otherness, such a dream in most cases is quickly “disassembled” by the consciousness and transferred to the modus of the cause-effect relationship with a taste for something silly and strange, being freed from any value. From here, obviously, comes the idea of Freud on the alert inner “censor”. But the hypothesis of Freud was expressed long before the concepts of paradigmatic thinking. Due to such typical human rationalization or, saying more specifically, due to the distortion by consciousness of the world of dreams during contact with it, the key point in the analysis of dreams is the right approach to their realization. A correct approach to dream recollection is the belief in its quirky off-discursive world: the world just as real as the world of our wakefulness. This view allows interacting with the world of dreams, and, therefore, seeing not only dreams, but also our so-called “objective reality” in a different way, without “glasses” of the

episteme. Speaking of the right approach, we understand the direct reading of the word “right”, i.e., the acceptance of the reality of a dream as it is, compliance with all the elements expressed in dreams, their space, their time or place, no matter how strange they may seem. But there is no doubt that the mere recollection of dreams as a contact with the border, the other world already affects our everyday conscious world. However, this effect is devoid of our individual initiative, our conscious will in creation – we remain only the performers, rather than directors of the show, in which we play. Remembering a dream, and not realizing that we are working, in fact, in the mode of creation of reality, we again find ourselves in the accident zone being captives of *doxa* – ideas, opinions, general propositions... for “we do not know what we are CREATING”. So there is no contradiction in the fact that interpretations of the concepts on dreams by Freud and Jung are often opposed. This says that the purpose of those scientists was not ontological, but therapeutic, even if the scientists themselves did not realize it fully. In this case, the psychological interpretation of the dream is not the interpretation of “messages”, but the creation of meaning, too, i.e., empowering the meaningless space of dreams with the meaning which could have a therapeutic effect gradually, in each case being individual, special.

RESULTS

Thus, based on our assumption, it turns out that dream is the only (or almost only) thing that exists in our world outside of the semantic paradigm, and competent interpretation of dreams can overcome the vicious circle of cause and effect of mental illness or gradually go beyond the laws of some inner complex. And here the role of a professional analyst-therapist is huge as one cannot do oneself what is possible to do during the analysis, it is very difficult (although not at all impossible – in fact, there is “Red Book” by Jung (Jung, 2009), by which he actually re-created himself). In our opinion, self-interpretation of dream is considered inefficient in depth psychology simply because you need to know what missing sense is necessary to be brought in a meaningless dream space in the life of a person, in order to achieve the desired therapeutic effect; for this we need an external look of a highly qualified observer – such as a professional psychoanalyst. Self-experiments outside of an analysis can be extremely dangerous, but we will speak on that a little later. So, we found that each person derives from the dreams a vision of existence outside of meaning, and remembering the dreams, interprets it, at least in fragments, thereby affecting the episteme of his time, and most people do it unconsciously. Unconscious influence on the episteme initiates its random motion in an indeterminate direction. If such an assumption about the stochastic (occasional) effects of every person’s dreams on the existing episteme is true, then it follows that this episteme itself does not move to any concrete result and has no preset teleological orientation. From this vision of reality, the ideas on the rule of chance and fate emerge, represented in

the mechanistic model of the Universe, typical of the Enlightenment and following decades. But in such non-preset evolution of the episteme is the key that can help a person to stop being a “cog” in the huge machinery, and begin to move the whole worldview system in the desired direction. And such a key, such a means is given to everyone – our dreams. Giving meaning to dreams – dreams, considered with an unbiased look – triggers the episteme motion. When a person consciously creates one’s own reality by vesting meaningless with sense, even a small impulse in the same direction can play the role of a strange attractor and change the movement of the entire ideology or sense-value system, break beyond the preset causality. After all, through dreams, presumably, we see the existence which thinkers of the 20th-21st centuries referred to as “open” as per J. Agamben (Agamben, 2004), or “non-hidden” as per M. Heidegger (Heidegger, 1962) – that is, the existence as is. It is for a good reason that all the prominent psychoanalysts placed such importance on the interpretation of dreams. For example, Jung repeatedly urged to listen to the “two million years old” man who comes and advises us in our dreams. It is no coincidence that the voice from dreams has been seen by many people throughout almost all of human history as prophetic: as the voice of God, or gods – it is in a dream when we can often see things from the off-human point of view; things presented in a different way. This, obviously, is the basis of the alchemy practice, as well as the practice of magic and mantics (here we combine these notions, since within this perspective, is very difficult to separate the prediction of the future from its creation).

Examples of the Application of the Results

We remind that according to Michel Foucault, outside of discursive practices an object does not exist; therefore, realizing what was before outside the zone of consciousness, we are in the strict sense creating this thing. Thus, realizing the world in a new way, we create it. Or, as written in Moses: “And God said, let there be light. And there was light” – that is, before naming light, there was none, because it did not exist in a discursive, linguistic practice, if the system of Michel Foucault is applied to Book of Books. Or as it is written in John: “In the beginning was the Word...” – from which it is also possible to conclude that before the Word (Logos) there was no “beginning”, just the world of our meaningless dreams, the world outside the episteme, total integration into being. In essence, it is the continuity of animal existence. Or, as Hyman Steinthal wrote: “The animal has memory, but no memories” (Steinthal, 2016; Agamben, 2004). To paraphrase this German philosopher, we can say: “Animals have sleep, but no dreams” (if we understand the dream as a vision of dream being something different from the perception of awake consciousness). Excellent illustration of the idea in connection with bringing sense to originally senseless existence and recognition of its value is contained in European alchemical treatises of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance. Basic

descriptions of such material to the alchemy concepts as *Prima materia*, and the Stone of the Philosophers are reduced essentially to the following: First Matter (like Stone of the Wise) is everywhere, but none of the people notice it, although seeing all the time, and it also is what the average person considers devoid of values: dirt or even excrement (Eliade, 1994). But then the adepts of alchemical arts warned: *But don't search it in manure at all,*

*Or you will suffer kind of a great shame,
And would you be engaged in such nonsense,
The whole country will make fun of you...*
(Michelschpacher, 2008)

Thus, the masters of Doing were kind of hinting at allegorical comparisons of the Stone of the Wise with manure... Are these hints not a direct indication to how sense was created from inherently meaningless space? Open existence – that is, the existence not endowed with the human sense – is really everywhere, no one can see it outside the sense system until the “key” to the world of own dreams, to the inner world of mental life is found. Until the man acquires such “keys”, he perceives the reality of senseless as something devoid of values (hence, the comparison with dirt and excrements). But it is this existence which has the highest value, since it is meaningless existence, devoid of ideology, which can be filled with any, even the highest, sense. Likewise I consider the books of the adepts of Art. Meantime, many people have been making attempts to interpret alchemical treatises (both strictly scientific and fantastic), but are these contradictory attempts just making sense of initially meaningless text? The text that was created (or rather taken from Dreams) by apologists of Doing based on its essential meaninglessness or purity from the paradigm, therefore being open to interpretation (i.e., filling with necessary sense). And if we consider the alchemical manuscripts in this context, it should be recognized that Jung (Jung, 1944), despite the fact that he was not particularly versed in the intricacies of chemical processes, which (according to the scientific version) sometimes were identified in the alchemical manuscripts analyzed by him, however, caught the most important thing that was in the works of the alchemists – the desire to give the necessary meaning to the meaningless. Being just as meaningless as our dreams, and much likely borrowed from them, the Alchemist's Book was not a guide, but a means to transform anything ignoble to noble, a means to transform the non-anthropomorphic world before Logos to human-size view of Kabbalistic Adam Kadmon – not a merely accidental, but conscious creation of the world, commensurate to the adept's ideas and aspirations. And the fact that dreams and books of masters of the art contained chemicals (Sulphur, mercury and salt, alum, etc.), simply indicates that these people were chemists by their activity. After all, everyone often sees in dreams what is occurring on a daily basis, but quite differently than being awake. So the proof that alchemical texts

are only encryption of chemical processes and their compounds, does not prove anything about the deep nature of texts themselves, even if there can be found an accurate description of actual chemical reactions.

Effectiveness and Dangers in the Practical Application of the Research Results

If we look at the discourse of alchemical treatises precisely as “discourse, devoid of discourse”, one more important idea follows from that: no adept deceived the reader, promising in the preface to give him exactly the means to obtain the Stone. However, in dozens, if not hundreds of surviving texts there is no distinct recipe. Could really hundreds of famous people, including, for example, such as St. Thomas Aquinas, merely fool their unpretentious readers spending valuable parchment on mischief? This is somewhat very unlikely... Rather, each of the adherents in his treatise gave us not only a means for making the Stone, but also **the Stone** – each book was thus the Stone of the Wise. But if you read at least a single alchemical treatise, you would immediately remember that the text would constantly, like a refrain, contain the phrase – this book should not be in the hands of unworthy. Why such a ban? Why cannot a book capable of turning lead into gold, make a fool of a scholar? Or was it what the adepts feared most? Were they afraid of competition? Were they afraid of losing their high intellectual status? Here we come to the problems that can arise when working with meaningless. The point is that that when coming across meaningless space – whether alchemical space or space of dreams – people consciously or unconsciously create a new meaning, i.e., create a new causal chain that will further go in compliance with the preset laws of the new sense. And, even if opined by the man that giving new sense to the space of dreams by him thus creates something beautiful, in practice is not guaranteed from leading him to a disaster. Missing small detail, misunderstanding of its role, the acting forces and the situation itself, and... the man becomes a victim of himself. Hence, obviously originates a common person’s panic fear of magic and mantics, and often, of depth psychology. It is believed that “digging” into the depths of the human psyche and the world of the outside often means self-sentence to death, or at least losing mind. Such prejudices are actually not baseless: contacting with the numinous reality, devoid of anthropomorphic sense, a person includes it in own discursive practices (i.e., interprets it), but does it as a rule unconsciously, and, therefore, “does not know **what** he was doing”. In this case, he is like a monkey with a gun, as he initiates the processes that he cannot control, which once again demonstrates the enormous responsibility of the therapist when analyzing a patient’s dreams. Each incorrect interpretation may lead to a deterioration, if not a fatal outcome. Disappointing results may be ensured through the work of the uninitiated with deep alchemical or magical practices – and from such a disaster the adepts of alchemy were trying to keep the profane consciousness, conjuring not give a

grimoire in the hands of someone who is not confident in Doing, one who is not instructed by the Master. However, the purpose of this article is not to deter from the study of creation of meaning out of meaningless, but on the contrary – to draw attention of the scientific community to this issue. Since the use of its right solution is a hundred times greater the related risks. After all, the solution to this problem may change not only the way of thinking of the modern man, but his everyday life.

Particular Examples of Applying

We will try to specify the situation and imagine the following simple illustration: a man comes to another seeking for cooperation or with some request, and if the answer of the latter is not predetermined already by some material circumstances, and is located approximately in the area of “fifty-fifty”, the choice of the response will depend on millions of small details, on the appearance of the asker, his manner of speaking, the time of communication, speaking rate, word order, the position of hands and feet during a conversation, etc. However, it is unlikely that anyone in the world can control millions of such parameters on the conscious level. Most small movements, for example, occur in the context of the situation, or in a complex way, independently. But on the kind of semantic vector involved in this situation, the answer of the requested will depend. Man, consciously or unconsciously interpreting his dream, gets subsequent *positive* or *negative* results in everyday life, as at all levels of existence (both perceived and situational, unconscious) he will “spontaneously” do *everything* to achieve the realization for the set senseless space of dream some *new sense*. One should not indulge in frivolity and think that if a person before a meeting important for him interprets his dream as the answer “yes”, then he will sure get a “yes”. Of course, everything is much more complicated. It is important to consistently, by interpretation of dreams, *eliminate all the blocks* that undermine a person’s evolving, adequately adapting to live and work; so, seeing one’s own faults through the “naked”, deprived of the ordinary meaning space of dreams, and trying to fix them, and accepting those that cannot be eliminated. Then, a consciously interpreted dream will really be able to launch a whole series of events leading to the desired result. We believe that magic systems are also based on this principle. For example, an endless narration of so-called “barbarian names” in medieval grimoires – is not it an attempt to break out of sense to the meaninglessness of pure existence, symbolically limiting the impact of *doxa* on a magician to the saving circle on the ground? Creation of a new sense, creation of a new young world from the deteriorated world – this is what shamans, magicians and alchemists of all ages were making as the genuine Art. And since no event means anything for us *as it is*, but only within the entire system of our views, it is not difficult to guess how much can be achieved via the reconsideration or rearrangement of components inside *the system of values*. Coming from the only episteme available to us, or Matrix (like in the famous blockbuster) we can rethink reality and create another one, in a new way

having organized value levels and values of particular situations. After all, in the world, according to M. Heidegger, really *all and anything is going on at the same time*, we, merely because of our limited human perception, have certain perception dominants and pay attention only to what is determined either by the episteme of our current era, or its internal local (ethnic or professional) discourses, or some mix of discourses, pathetically called “our personal view of the world”. Rethinking the very ideological model from scratch of the open being, we can, relatively speaking, affect the entire world that we perceive as a whole as to consciously discover and to create in this case is identical. Here lies the nature of synchronicity (Jung, 1952): because under synchronicity, in fact, we are just beginning to see the phenomena, which we could not previously notice, being under the dictatorship of a particular ideology, or episteme, but, to remind again, to notice and to create is the same. Since what is “behind the scenes of consciousness” would not exist for us, and what remains “behind the scenes of consciousness of all people in general” actually does not exist in the strictly scientific sense of that word, since it is not perceived and cannot be verified, and anything not perceived by the universal consciousness is pure potentiality.

DISCUSSION

Example of Solving a Problem

As you may recall, we adopted as one of the provisions of our hypothesis that an episteme has no purpose and direction. In this case, being purposefully engaged in sense-creation and gradually solving task by task in connection with re-creation of the world image that surrounds us, the entire world in the literal and not allegorical sense may submit to this imperative and begin to move in the direction of human will, creating new sense – as the episteme has no purpose to move in any particular direction, and a strong will, and above all the knowledge “how to” can turn it in almost any direction. Examples of such turns in the history of art, politics and science equal thousands. On the same principle are based the predictive practices around the world, as analyzed in detail in the book by Zaytsev “Faces of the mysteries” (Zaytsev, 2015). Their strength is in the attempt to break into the zone of the meaningless, the random and comprehend it as if the above random had direct relation to future or past events. That is, give a sense to the senseless. And equally it can be attributed both to the prediction of the future, and the prophecies about the unknown past. After all, the past is also changing: as the events themselves do not mean much – only their value interrelation in the public models of reality does, that is, in discursive practice which (even in the historical science) has been evolving, changing the subject of its research, too – the past. Realizing somewhere in the depths of their souls the inner connection of mantics and creation of reality, most common people superstitiously are in awe of prediction – citing the idea that predicted fate cannot be changed. And

this also has a fair share of the truth. We have already mentioned the dangers of negative/unconscious interpretation of the meaningless. Much the same is happening in this case. The man, who had a divination ritual, that is, from our point of view, interpretation of meaningless existence, receives a kind of “message”, but it may have destructive action on him. For example, a prophet tells that he will die next week. And instead of breaking out of this pernicious system of meaning, a person in 99% cases by all actions will unknowingly contribute to the fulfilment of this prediction, and with a high probability it will come true, since a person, who is in the episteme zone and unable to escape from it, has no choice. Meantime, there is no choice in the essence as there was none before the prediction. He is just a sliver floating in the flow of random situations... Yes, he can initiate the development of some events (including through prediction), but it does not cancel the same probability of these events. In fact, his life may change, but unconsciousness remains, and therefore inability to change something in the direction required to the man. On the other hand, the prediction can cause two other models of human behavior to be realized. The first is that prediction will not be perceived as a “message” from the numinous world of the meaningless and it will not change anything in the system of human views. Such an “impenetrable” by the numinous world type of perception does exist, and occurs quite often, but really is not much different from the above example, as such a person cannot be the master of his life either. He is in a unified system of views, in the Matrix, and there is not much to choose from. A different model of events which can happen to a person with prediction is that, by taking a deep “message”, a man tries to transform the situation so that no predicted negative aspect would occur. For example, if according to the prediction someone should die, if he becomes another person by thoughts and actions – that “new one” will not die, because symbolically, “old one” is already dead...

Another Solution to the Problem

Let us illustrate this with the example of psychological consulting on Tarot cards using their location system on the traditional image of the Tree of Life. If a person draws a card extremely unpleasant and wishes to avoid it, there is a good method invented by Grigory Zaytsev (Zaytsev, 2015). We need to find where this card, for example, five of the Discs (signifying “loss” and “need”) is on the Tree of Life – this card corresponds to Sefira Gevura, i.e., the left side of the Tree of Life. Next, you need to choose the situation (embodied in Tarot card) to which the person would like to come, for example, 6 of Discs (“gift”, “well-being”) – this card corresponds to the Sefira Tifferet, i.e., is located in the central part of the Tree of Life. Then, it is required to see which way they are joined on the Tree of Life. In this case, it is the twenty-second path of the Tree of Life (the path Lamed) – in French school of Tarot, the twelfth arcanum path, called “Hanged Man”. Thus, if a person completely revises (overturns) his views on his existence (this often means the card is “Hanged

Man”) – he will be able to receive as a result not “need”, but “well-being”. If he is afraid of “Hanged Man” card, it is possible to move from the starting point to the final destination indirectly through many arcanums: not after one, but after several steps reaching the goal. So, the original interpretative concept is that Grigory Zaytsev *a priori* suggests total mobility, which is missing in systems that require only to adhere to a view preset by the episteme. It is within the episteme where meaningless space becomes destructive and, in some sense, even “absolute evil”. But outside it, the meaningless space is the Gold of the Philosophers – because it is one of the highest phenomena, given to the man. After all, there lies the opportunity to create.

CONCLUSION

But let us no more be distracted by mantics or magic related thinking, because in this article we are not talking about the occult mysteries of the ancient world or the medieval Europe, but about the means, which is given to all people initially – the Stone of the Wise, which is always present with us but we are unaware of the fact that we are so unspeakably rich; about our dreams – because with their help, people can create a new meaning, create a new paradigm. For a good reason the legend says that Dmitri Ivanovich Mendeleev saw his periodic table of chemical elements in a dream. It does not mean that for any of us that periodic table would come in a dream. It came to the man, who all his life was engaged in its creation. But in the context of the old scientific system, it could not be developed even by a great scientist, as he was dominated by the old system of views, the old discourse. And in his dreams he sees what he knows inside out, but sees outside this discourse. And, freed from this old paradigm, the scientist sees the correlation of chemical elements formed in his mind into a coherent model – there is a scientific revolution, a new discourse. It does not matter whether this really was. The image of the scientist who created a new world of science of a dream (as the highest *coniunctio*, combining the pair of opposites), assimilated into the culture, because it is rooted in something much more personal and closer to each than chemistry or physics, namely, spiritual life of the man. It is no coincidence that another great scientist Wolfgang Pauli (Lindorff, 2004), as evidenced by materials about him, also was creating scientific concepts, interpreting his dreams – the last line of meaning, the border between what is and what is not. For non-existent for us, but present closely, as a pure potentiality, may at any time emerge and give the world a new meaning, not yet known to date. This idea largely explains the creation of new trends in art, as well as scientific revolutions, called “discoveries of the century”. But were these scientists and artists discoverers of a new world, or its creators? Through self-reflection in the space of open existence, we begin to create ourselves, realize ourselves, build ourselves and build our new universe... And if the man can really turn the dullness of everyday routine into gold of dreams, the cherished desire of mankind will come true, and the Stone of the Wise will be obtained, and the covenant of Gerhard Dorn (Dorn,

2001), a great alchemist of the Renaissance will fulfill; he wrote: “Turn yourselves into living philosophical stones (*Transmutemini in vivos lapides philosophicos*)”. However, a careful reader may wish to argue that if everyone begins to move the existing episteme in the desired direction, there is nothing in the current situation to change, because this episteme will still continue to receive stochastic shocks from different directions, and will continue to move randomly and therefore, in fact, nowhere... But actually, this is not true. When the mankind acquires the ability to work with dreams and recognize the supreme value of the world which is not yet endowed with meaning, then the episteme will be moved forward by those who are able to realize the open existence deeper and give it a new meaning more effectively. But it will be the next higher turn of the spiral, to which we have to go for centuries. Finalizing our ode to meaningless, we would like to say a few more words. We do not claim that our point of view on the nature of dream is to replace different views and approaches to the problem. We exactly stand on the position of multiple-layered sense reality and believe that various systems of even mutually exclusive meanings can coexist simultaneously on different levels of being. And the greater the number of simultaneously coexisting worlds of meaning we are able to see, the more opportunities we will have, the more varied our choice. After all, to choose the world in which we live, we need to have at least two models of reality to choose from. And the second – different – model, a different perspective is given to us by our dreams, enabling anyone to touch the opportunity to become the creator of own universe and like an adept of Freemasonry to say: “I was born free!”

References

- Agamben, G. (2004). *The Open: Man and Animal* (K. Attell, Trans.). Stanford: Stanford University.
- Althusser, L. (1969). *For Marx* (B. Brewster, Trans.). The Penguin Press by Allen Lane.
- Carl, W. (1994). *Frege's Theory of Sense and Reference: Its Origin and Scope (Modern European Philosophy)*. Cambridge University Press.
- Dennett, D. (1997). *Kinds of Minds: Towards an Understanding of Consciousness*. New York: Basic Books.
- Derrida, J. (1978). *Writing and Difference* (A. Bass, Trans.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Derrida, J. (1987). *The Post Card: From Socrates to Freud and Beyond* (A. Bass, Trans.). Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press.
- Dorn, G. (2001) *Filosofia meditativa. Alchimia e meditazione*. Arkeios.
- Eliade, M. (1994). *The Forge and the Crucible*. State University of New York Press.
- Foucault, M. (1970). *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*. N. Y.: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (2002). *Archaeology of Knowledge* (A. M. Sheridan Smith, Trans.). London: Routledge.
- Franz, von M. L. (1979). *Alchemical Active Imagination*. Texas: Spring Publ.

- Franz, von M. L. (1991). *Dreams*. Boston: Shambhala.
- Franz, von M. L. (1994). *The Way of the Dream*. Boston: Shambhala.
- Franz, von M. L. (1998). *On Dreams & Death: A Jungian Interpretation*. Chicago: Open Court.
- Freud, S. (2010). *The Interpretation of Dreams* (A.A. Brill, Trans., 3rd ed.). New York: Bartleby.com.
- Hall, J.A. (1983). *Jungian Dream Interpretation: A Handbook of Theory and Practice*. Inner City Books.
- Hannah, B. (2003). *Encounters with the Soul*. Chiron Publications.
- Heidegger, M. (1962). *Being and Time* (J. Macquarrie, & E. Robinson, Trans.). Harper and Row Publishers.
- Hillman, J. (1998). *Healing Fiction*. Woodstock, CT, U.S.: Spring Publications.
- Johnson, R.A. (1989). *Inner Work: Using Dreams and Active Imagination for Personal Growth*. Harper & Row.
- Jung, C.G. (1944). Psychology and Alchemy. In C.G. Jung, *Collected works* (2nd ed., Vol. 12). London: Routledge.
- Jung, C.G. (1952). *Synchronicity: An Acausal Connecting Principle*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Jung, C.G. (1974). *Dreams*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Jung, C.G. (1997). *Jung on Active Imagination* (J. Chodorow, Ed.). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Jung, C.G. (2007). *Children's Dreams*. Philemon Series.
- Jung, C.G. (2009). *The Red Book. Liber Novus* (S. Shamdasani, Ed.). Philemon Series & W.W. Norton & Co.
- Jung, C.G. (2014). *Dream Interpretation Ancient and Modern*. Philemon Series & Princeton University Press.
- Kuhn, T.S. (1962). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lacan, J. (1977). *The Seminar, Book XI, The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psychoanalysis* (A. Sheridan, Trans.). New York: W.W. Norton & Co.
- Lindorff, D. (2004). *Pauli and Jung: The Meeting of Two Great Minds*. Quest Books.
- Metzinger, T. (2009). *The Ego Tunnel – The Science of the Mind and the Myth of the Self*. New York: Basic Books.
- Michelschpacher, S. (2008). *Kabala [Cabala]*. Kiev: IP Bereza S.I.
- Novaya filosofskaya entsiklopediya [New Philosophical Encyclopedia]*. (2001). Moscow: Mysl'.
- Stein, M. (2009). *In Midlife: A Jungian Perspective*. Spring Publications.
- Steinthal, H. (2016). *Grammatik, Logik Und Psychologie*. Verlag Der Wissenschaften.
- Turner, V. (1970). *The Forest of Symbols: Aspects of Ndembu Ritual*. Cornell University.
- Uexküll, von J. J. (1928). *Theoretische Biologie* (2nd ed.). Springer.
- Zaytsev, G. (2015). Sistemnyy podkhod k mantike i magii Taro [Systematic Approach to the Mantics and Magic of Tarot]. *Khroniki Taro, 11*, 76-87.
- Zaytsev, G. (2015). *Liki misteriy [Faces of Mysteries]*. Moscow: Castalia.
- Žižek, S. (2004). *Iraq: The Borrowed Kettle*. London: Verso.
- Žižek, S. (2006). *The Parallax View*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.