

無睡與無醒-Dreamstate

A convergence I predicted, went looking for, and did not find — 無術 *Mo Jitsu*, Chapter Three

An earlier document in this series found something that held across five traditions with no contact between them: every tradition that produced a scripture also produced a warning against worshipping it. Nehushtan smashed, the letter that kills, the Dao that cannot be spoken. Independent invention of the same guard.

So when the question turned to **the world as a dream** — an idea that *feels* universal, that everyone can quote in some form — the obvious expectation was more of the same. A shared intuition, arrived at separately, everywhere.

It was worth twenty minutes to check rather than assert. The result went the other way.

The count

Eighteen collections, 4,909 passages: scripture, martial treatises, Sufi poetry, Stoic journals, Shinto records, Chan and Zen material. Counted for dream vocabulary, and separately for passages linking dreams to *illusion* or *awakening* — the specific idea that waking life is itself the dream.

COLLECTION	PASSAGES	DREAM	%	DREAM + ILLUSION/WAKING
Rumi, Masnavi	951	71	7.5%	18
Raja Yoga (Patanjali / Vivekananda)	279	19	6.8%	4
Zen, Suzuki	160	10	6.2%	6
King James Bible	1695	44	2.6%	1
Musashi, Dokkodo	244	6	2.5%	0
Shinto shrines guide	322	7	2.2%	1
nine further collections	1258	0	0%	0
total	4909	160	3.3%	30

**Nine of eighteen collections never mention a dream at all.
Of thirty passages that link dreaming to illusion, eighteen are
one author.**

Among the silent nine: the Kojiki, Legge's Tao Te Ching, the Platform Sutra of Hui Neng, and the Meditations of Marcus Aurelius. Not thin coverage. **Zero.**

So the prediction failed, and it failed in a specific direction. The world-as-dream is not a distributed human intuition arrived at independently. In this corpus it is **concentrated** — overwhelmingly Sufi, secondarily Yogic and Zen, and effectively absent everywhere else. Rumi alone accounts for 60% of every passage that makes the connection.

THE DISTINCTION THE BIBLE DRAWS AND THE OTHERS DON'T

The King James collection mentions dreams **44** times and connects them to illusion or awakening **once**. That is not indifference — it is a different theory. Biblical dreams are *messages*: they have content, they come from outside, and they require an interpreter. Nebuchadnezzar cannot read his own dream; he has to send for Daniel.

That is nearly the opposite of the Sufi and Zen reading, where the dream has no author to consult and the only move is to wake. One word, three incompatible objects:

TRADITION	A DREAM IS	WHO ACTS ON IT
Hebrew / Christian	a message with content, from outside	an interpreter
Yogic	a mechanism — a ripple in the chitta	nobody; it is how memory behaves
Sufi / Zen	a diagnosis of your waking life	you, now

Only one of the three treats the dream as informative. Only one offers a mechanism. Counting them together as “the dream tradition” would have merged three unrelated claims into one average that describes none of them.

The second sleep

The sharpest passage in the vault is not the familiar one. Rumi has the standard line — *this world, which is the sleeper's dream* — and then he closes the exit:

*Know, O comrade, that your sleep and waking (your life in this world) is as though a sleeper should dream that he has gone to sleep. He thinks, “**Now I am asleep,**” and is unaware that he is really in the **second sleep**.*

— *Masnavi*, 1735

Noticing that you are asleep is itself something a sleeper can do. The recognition is available inside the dream, which means the recognition proves nothing. Every argument of the form *this is too strange to be real* is answered in advance by this passage: strangeness does not discriminate, because the dreamer can notice strangeness too.

AND WHAT THAT COSTS THE LUCID READING

If it is a dream, the tempting corollary is that we have more control than we think — lucidity. It gives less than it promises, and for a structural reason.

Control in a lucid dream comes from **sole authorship**: in a private dream nothing else is generating content, so recognising that you are the author simply *is* control. There was never a competing author to overcome. A *shared* dream removes that mechanism. Lucidity would grant authority over your own contribution and nothing else — which is precisely the control you already had. The hypothesis relocates the explanation without adding a single new power.

What lucidity reliably buys, in the actual research and in every tradition above that bothers with it, is smaller and more useful: the nightmare stops being terrifying, consequences stop reading as permanent, and you act deliberately rather than reactively. A changed relationship to the content, not changed content. Marcus Aurelius reaches the same place with no metaphysics at all — *if you are distressed by anything external, the pain is not due to the thing itself but to your estimate of it* — which may be why his collection needs no dream vocabulary to say it.

So how do you get in?

Every source above asserts something about the dream. A fair next question is whether any of them says what to *do* about it. The vault was queried for method — practice, technique, steps, what to do — and the four answers are not four versions of one answer. They are four different questions being answered.

COLLECTION	DREAM PASSAGES	CONTAINING METHOD VOCABULARY	RATE
Raja Yoga	33	24	73%
Zen, Suzuki	29	15	52%
Rumi, Masnavi	190	84	44%
King James Bible	107	29	27%

The rates undersell the difference, because the vocabulary can appear without any instruction behind it.

ONE OF THEM IS A MANUAL

Raja Yoga gives graded technique, and one line gives away that it has been taught to real people:

Take some holy person, some great person whom you revere, some saint whom you know to be perfectly non-attached, and think of his heart... it will calm the mind. **If you cannot do that, there is the next way:**

That is a fallback ladder. Explicit alternatives for the student who fails at step one. Nobody writes that sentence without having watched somebody fail — it is the error layer, present, in a tradition that had every excuse to leave it out. Elsewhere it specifies breath: *get control of the nerves... rhythmical breathing is therefore necessary.*

ONE ANSWERS A DIFFERENT QUESTION THAN THE ONE ASKED

Query Rumi for method — practice, technique, what to do — and the retrieval returns the *same two passages* it returns for the claim. The second sleep. The sleeper's dream. His 44% is method vocabulary appearing incidentally inside poetry, not instruction. **Ask Rumi how, and he tells you what.**

ONE ARGUES THAT METHOD DOES NOT WORK, THEN PRESCRIBES SOME

Zen states it outright: *you may have most earnestly and diligently disciplined yourself for the past three asamkhyeya kalpas... but when you come to have a realization in one thought.* Practice does not cause the thing. Then it names Sila and Samadhi as what is needed anyway. That is not an omission; it is a doctrine, holding a contradiction on purpose.

AND ONE IS ANSWERING A QUESTION THE OTHERS NEVER ASK

The King James material is not an access method at all, and a first reading of it here was wrong. Jeremiah 29:8–9 — “*neither hearken to your dreams which ye cause to be dreamed*” — was initially read in this project as a **prohibition** on inducing dream states. David pushed back that it sounded more like *be careful* than *do not*. Counting settled it.

KJV PASSAGES MENTIONING DREAMS	46
framed as God-sent	9
framed as false or deceiving	11
containing <i>both</i> framings	2

A corpus running dreams in both directions cannot be banning them — and could not, with Joseph, Jacob, Daniel and Solomon at Gibeon all receiving them. In context the passage is sharper than a ban: the letter tells the exiles it will be seventy years, the false prophets were selling *soon*, and *dreams which ye cause to be dreamed* names the failure mode precisely — **dreams that tell you what you already wanted to hear.**

It is not a prohibition. It is a discernment rule — the only one in the vault that treats a dream as something that can lie to you.

TRADITION	THE QUESTION IT ACTUALLY ANSWERS
Raja Yoga	<i>how</i> — graded technique, with fallbacks for failure
Zen	<i>whether technique works at all</i> — no, but practise anyway
Rumi	<i>what it is</i> — returns the diagnosis when asked for the method
King James	<i>which ones to trust</i> — a discernment rule, not an access method

Given the second sleep, the Hebrew question may be the most practical of the four. If noticing that you are asleep is available to the sleeper, then the useful skill was never getting in. It is telling a true signal from one you manufactured — and only one tradition on this shelf is working on that problem.

HOW THE CORRECTION HAPPENED, SINCE IT MATTERS

The prohibition reading came from a single strong-sounding clause, generalised to a doctrine, **without checking whether the rest of the corpus contradicted it**. It did, and two minutes of counting found it. That is this project's own failure mode committed by its author: reading one passage and calling it a tradition. It is recorded here rather than quietly fixed, because the mechanism is worth more than the corrected sentence.

Limits

Eighteen collections is not a survey of human religion. It is one person's shelf, weighted heavily toward martial arts, in English translation. The Kojiki's silence may be this edition's silence; a different Shinto corpus could speak. Absence in a sample is absence in a sample.

Word counting is not concept counting. A tradition can hold the idea under vocabulary this search does not know. The count is a floor, not a census.

The Marcus Aurelius text is badly OCR'd — spaces stripped, words fused — so its zero is partly a data defect and should not be read as evidence about Stoicism.

What survives all three caveats is the shape, not the number: the world-as-dream reads as universal and, where it could be checked, was not. That is worth knowing precisely because the earlier convergence finding was real. Convergence is not the default. It has to be measured each time, and sometimes the answer is that one poet in the thirteenth century said it better than everyone else and the rest of the shelf was talking about something else entirely.

無術 · Mo Jitsu · 無睡與無醒-Dreamstate — drafted 2026-08-27. 睡 is sleep; the title is David's, romanised as he spells it. It reads two ways and both are in the document: the world-as-dream turned out to be concentrated rather than universal — most of the shelf was never dreaming at all — and Rumi's second sleep says the recognition does not get you out either. Corpus: 18 collections, 4,909 passages, queried by embedding similarity and then counted by regular expression for dream, illusion and waking vocabulary. Prediction stated before counting; result recorded as stated. The convergence hypothesis was mine and it did not survive.