

UNITED WISDOM

Influence, imitation and your own voice

Freedom and Action

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

A-25-N02 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Influence, imitation and your own voice

Epigraph

> *imitation alone is not sufficient*

Quintilian, Institutio Oratoria X.2.4; brief excerpt from H. E. Butler’s translation. The context is rhetorical education.

What this article is about

A favourite book, a narrator’s voice or another painting’s construction can enter a work before its maker notices the influence. That requires neither immediate rejection of the model nor declaring every resemblance a personal style. It helps to distinguish what attracted attention, which decision was understood and what entered new material. This article follows Ilya’s hypothetical audio story about a bicycle workshop as he notices an admired manner in his recording. He analyses a device, separates a study version from a possible showing and seeks reasons within his own scene. Quintilian, Seneca and Poe offer different historical questions about imitation, assimilation and composition. Comparing them promises no unique voice or universal measure of originality. The practice retains precise attribution, the distinction between observation and invention, and freedom to decline an unsuitable manner. A voice is discussed through decisions in a particular work, rather than an ability diagnosis or a demand to remove all other influences.

I. Name what attracted you

Ilya is preparing a short audio story about an old workshop where bicycles were once repaired. Listening to a favourite author, he notices an opening object, a pause and only then a person. His first version repeats a similar order, intonation and kind of comparison. The mood is recognisable, but the workshop scarcely appears. In this hypothetical scene, influence has already occurred; the task is to understand its components. He need not prove that his ear is entirely independent. He needs to identify the decision he carried over and what it does to the present material.

Instead of saying only that he likes the style, Ilya names several observations. A concrete object comes first; explanation waits; the voice does not rush to explain a feeling; the last sentence changes the opening. Each observation still needs checking against the work. He may remember one successful recording and attribute its method to everything the author

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

makes. Examining a particular passage is more precise. It also distinguishes the effect he heard from the means he thinks produced it. Their relationship may differ from his first impression.

Influence can mean deliberate study, a reading habit, accidental resemblance or direct use of another person’s wording. These relationships need different descriptions. Ilya can learn a narrative order without using its sentences, or include a literal phrase that needs clear attribution. Acknowledging influence does not replace attribution of a quotation. Conversely, a reference beneath one sentence does not explain why an entire recording closely reproduces another voice. What matters is precision about the relationship, rather than listing everyone the maker has ever heard.

The work begins by distinguishing what attracted attention, what was understood and what was transferred. If Ilya cannot yet name the device, he can preserve that uncertainty and return to the recording. Admiration need not immediately become a method. A favourite author may remain a companion or a measure of interest rather than a performance model. That relationship is possible too. This article concerns an adult’s voluntary creative work; comparison does not assess personality, identify innate ability or promise that a learning method will inevitably produce a recognisable voice.

II. Learn the decision, not only the surface

A pause in another story may let an object be heard, separate a change in time or hold an event not yet named. Copying its duration transfers the surface of the device. Learning the decision means asking which parts it separates and what transition it marks. In the workshop, a metal patch box comes first, followed by the person opening it. That may call for a short break between object and action rather than a long reflective silence. The current material supplies its own reasons for choosing, even when another work supplied the question.

In Institutio Oratoria X.2, Quintilian asks learners to understand what merits imitation and why. He considers arrangement, circumstances and people as well as words. This concerns ancient rhetorical education. For an audio story, it offers a limited question about a device’s grounds, not a ready recording technique. Ilya can examine the pause’s relation to events without making victory over an opponent the aim of his workshop story or applying historical judgments about natural gifts to a contemporary person.

Analysis may reveal that the admired manner solves another task. The favourite author describes returning home after a long absence; Ilya describes work continuing every day. A slow ceremonial entrance could give the workshop a significance absent from his observation. Declining that opening does not reject learning. He understood the decision well enough to see

its boundary. He can retain attention to an object while changing pace, viewpoint or order. The borrowed question remains useful even though its first answer does not suit this story.

One passage and a few named relationships can be enough for analysis. Ilya need not explain someone’s entire creative system before trying a transition. He must not present a guess about intention as an established fact, however. He can say that the pause separates description from a person’s appearance, and that he experienced it as tense. The first statement concerns structure; the second his response. A claim about the author’s intention requires relevant evidence. Study then remains precise and leaves the work more complex than one convenient scheme.

III. An exercise has a boundary

Ilya can make a study version deliberately repeating the selected passage’s order and pace. Resemblance then becomes an agreed condition of the exercise rather than an accidental obstacle. He identifies what he is examining, such as delayed explanation. The study recording remains within a clear use context. If others will see it, its exercise status and model need explaining, while permission for borrowed material must be checked separately. Calling something educational does not itself permit unrestricted distribution of another recording, text or performance.

It helps to distinguish a study version from the story Ilya intends to present as his own finished work. These are different purposes, not judgments of his worth. In the first, detailed repetition can serve understanding. In the second, he must decide what the workshop actually needs and how retained borrowed elements are identified. One version may develop into the other, but the transition needs reconsideration. A changed filename cannot establish it. He returns to content and relationships before deciding how the recording will be used.

The exercise can end with a concrete observation: the long pause made the box central, although the later story concerned a person. That applies to this version and transition. It proves neither that slow speech never suits Ilya nor that every story must be faster. A friend who freely agrees to a short listening conversation adds another response. That response cannot stand for every future listener. A study frame remains useful when it reveals a relationship instead of turning one result into a permanent verdict on the maker’s voice.

After the exercise, Ilya can literally pause and return to his observation of the workshop. Which movements does he remember without another voice? What appeared first, what needed explanation, and which sound was actually audible? This cannot erase influence or guarantee originality. It changes the next decision’s basis: he compares a learned device with what he wants to convey. The other work remains part of the process without determining every new sentence. He can use what he learned selectively while keeping its origin intelligible.

IV. Several influences do not yet make a voice

Ilya likes another narrator’s conversational precision and a third narrator’s brief return to an opening detail. Combining all three devices can produce a series of recognisable gestures. Multiple models do not automatically create a new relationship between them. One transition requires silence, another accelerates speech, and another finishes the story before its action ends. He listens to how the decisions meet in one recording. The question is whether they serve this narrative’s course or merely display favourite methods in succession.

In Letter 84, Seneca uses gathered material, food and a chorus to describe assimilating reading. The concern is a change from retained material to a transformed relationship. This is a Stoic reflection on reading and life, not a modern creativity theory or memory study. Here the chorus image raises a question about the whole heard after parts are combined. It does not prove that origins should be concealed. Assimilation certainly does not cancel attribution of a literal quotation, collaboration or another performance present in the result.

Ilya chooses a basis for this version: the story follows the repairer’s actions with objects. An opening box, a conversational sentence and a returned detail can then find particular places. If the return changes nothing, it can be removed despite its expressiveness elsewhere. His decision consists in taking responsibility for relationships between parts. He need not declare every device a new invention. A familiar form may become suitable through different material and order. That relationship must appear in the work; a biographical claim about many influences cannot replace it.

Resemblance can remain after this work. Its presence does not automatically establish how independent the whole is. Specific words, arrangement, material and intended use matter. Ilya can acknowledge a noticeable relationship without dismissing his story or sheltering behind “everyone learns from everyone.” Doubts about permission for particular borrowed material need separate resolution; a historical metaphor cannot resolve them. This article offers careful distinctions, not a legal conclusion about a recording or a measure of originality valid for every genre and circumstance.

V. Material can resist an admired manner

In the workshop, Ilya saw quick conversations, unfinished questions and explanations made while moving. His solemn recording turned those movements into a commemorative ritual. He notices a mismatch between observation and narration. Such a change may be intentional: a maker can choose an invented form without presenting it as accurate documentary evidence. But he wanted to preserve everyday work, so this manner obstructs his aim. Material does not supply a ready voice; it presents differences that demand attention. He can change the form or explicitly change the aim rather than assume they already agree.

In X.2.23–24, Quintilian considers how style changes with circumstances and different parts of a speech. That does not establish one correct intonation for every subject. For Ilya, the useful question is correspondence. A slow entrance might suit a workshop's closure but not an ordinary morning. Within one story, the opening and repair scene may need different relationships. Imitation becomes selective when the maker can name that difference. He studies composition without making an admired manner compulsory for every topic he encounters.

To examine the mismatch, Ilya returns to one episode: the repairer searches for a small nut while answering a visitor. He records it more directly, retaining the action, then compares versions against his purpose. A casual listener's favourite need not decide a question about everyday movement. Personal preference also cannot cancel what the recording actually contains. The direct version may lose an important detail, calling for a third combination. Comparison helps formulate a decision; it does not guarantee that the first independent version wins.

A story about actual people needs another distinction. Changed intonation does not justify inventing someone's words or disclosing information not agreed for use. Our hypothetical examples provide no evidence about an actual repairer. In real work, accuracy, agreement to use material and artistic form need separate attention. A personal voice does not remove those questions. It also appears in how the maker identifies invention and observation, preserves the limits of knowledge and decides how another person will be represented.

VI. A voice is connected with choices

Ilya first looks for his voice in a special vocal colour. Timbre alone cannot explain the selected object, the ending or why one detail remains while another disappears. A work's voice can be considered more broadly as a recurring relationship to material, words and listeners. In this recording, that relationship appears through decisions. This does not define a person's hidden essence. It makes the work discussable without requiring a final identity before the maker writes or speaks the next sentence.

He keeps a small imperfect movement of speech because a polished explanation changed the scene. He removes an attractive comparison taken from another recording because it adds nothing to this workshop. He retains the quiet box sound because later action depends on it. Each decision has a reason here; together they begin to form a relationship. He may choose differently later. Change need not mean losing himself. Another story will bring his attention to different material, allowing a familiar approach to develop or give way.

Poe's "The Philosophy of Composition" recounts coordinating an intended effect and means in one poem. That retrospective account can be compared with Ilya's decisions while preserving

differences of genre and setting. It does not prove that a voice always arises from a calculated plan. Some decisions here followed recording and comparison; another process may find form earlier. The maker can still explain significant relationships now being maintained. An account of the process should not become a polished legend concealing trials, other contributions or an accidental useful detail.

“Finding a voice” can impose an unnecessary deadline, as though a maker must eventually stop resembling anyone. No such measure is established here. Ilya can work on this story, examine influences and choose more clearly without declaring the search complete. If someone hears resemblance, he can ask what it concerns: a sentence, pace or overall construction. A concrete observation can be examined; “this is not you” says little about the recording. He need not accept another person’s account of his essence to discuss the form attentively.

VII. Identify origins without erasing your work

Ilya decides to tell listeners that a particular recording taught him delayed explanation. A brief note can identify the author, work and relationship without replacing the story. A retained literal phrase needs its own attribution. Someone who recorded sound or helped compose the text contributed in another way. Distinguishing these relationships prevents every contribution from collapsing into “source.” The maker’s work and other people’s contributions remain visible according to their actual presence in the result.

A maker may fear that acknowledging influence will diminish the work. Omitting a note does not change an element’s origin. Precise attribution can move discussion away from vague claims of total independence toward what has been done with known material. It cannot promise a favourable response. Some listeners may find the relationship too close; others may not hear it. Ilya is responsible for his description and use, not identical responses from everyone. Acknowledgment need not become advance self-justification before every possible judgment.

Seneca’s images help consider transformation but provide no modern rule for hiding a work’s grounds. The letter speaks of bringing forth what has been made from assimilated material; that cannot simply become an instruction to conceal quotations. Stoic cultivation of reason differs from describing the origin of a released audio story. Our comparison therefore remains bounded. We take the question of transformed parts while clarifying actual use through the work and its setting. A historical author cannot validate whatever a contemporary maker finds convenient or profitable.

Ilya keeps a working note about the origins of decisions: one selected passage, a question about its construction, the study version and changes made for the workshop. It need not

become a public diary. It preserves a history where later precision may matter. An unclear relationship can be identified as tentative instead of explained confidently in retrospect. Responsibility for origins is compatible with independent work. He need neither erase influences nor reduce every decision to a mere extension of someone else’s piece.

VIII. A voice remains open to work

After several versions, the workshop is more clearly present in Ilya’s current intention. He can name the selected order and explain why he removed the long pause. That is a definite result, not proof of a permanently found voice. Another recording will bring new questions; some choices will remain and others change. Learning need not end with a declaration of total independence. He can identify what was learned, examined in his material and still uncertain. That clarity permits further work without requiring reinvention of every available form each week.

The three historical contexts meet around different questions. Quintilian considers grounds for imitation and suitability to circumstances; Seneca the assimilation of reading within Stoic education; Poe the coordination of means and effect in a retrospective account. They formulate no single doctrine of personal voice and study no contemporary recording. The connection belongs to this editorial argument and is useful insofar as it clarifies Ilya’s decisions. Differences remain. Several famous names establish neither the recording’s originality nor a universal benefit from the proposed exercise.

Ilya may keep the work private or continue studying. Not every exercise must become a released piece. If he chooses to show it, readiness, attribution and agreements concerning material need attention. A creative discovery does not remove those questions. Expressive work may still need precise attribution of a borrowed sentence. Properly attributed work may still need a changed order. These distinctions allow completion of a particular task without making one result stand for every other condition.

The practice below concerns one freely selected passage and one piece of the maker’s material. It does not measure talent, demand an unwelcome manner or promise uniqueness. Its possible outcome is understanding a transferred decision and why to retain, change or leave it in a study version. A voice is not hidden behind the complete absence of influence here. It becomes audible in responsibility for chosen relationships, attention to material and recognition of others. Further learning can expand that relationship without enclosing it in a final formula of personality.

What this means in practice

Choose a short passage from which you want to learn. Identify its maker and source, using it within available conditions. Describe one observable relationship: detail order, transition, pause, arrangement or ending. Distinguish observation from a guess about intention and from your response.

Take a small piece of your own material. Ask what it needs and whether that matches the model’s task. You may make an explicitly identified study version examining one device. Resemblance is no proof of independence; exercise status does not permit distribution of borrowed material without considering conditions.

Return to your object, episode or observation. Name what the transferred device reveals and obstructs. Make a manageable change for the material, rather than compulsory difference from the model. If someone listens, agree on a specific short question and their freedom to decline. One response concerns this version, not every future audience.

Compare versions against the stated task. Retain the device, change it or keep the version as study. Identify literal elements and actual contributions separately from a general influence note. Do not invent a precise history where the relationship remains tentative.

Record one decision and its reason. You need not declare a permanently found voice or release the result. The practice establishes neither talent, originality nor permission for every particular use. Its outcome may be a clearer relationship to what you learn and what you choose.

Key quotation

> *Yet out of the many only one voice results.*

Seneca, Letter 84.9, translated by Richard M. Gummere. The chorus image concerns assimilating reading; it does not remove attribution.

Connections between traditions

Context	Question actually read	Application here	Boundary
Quintilian, X.2.4	Imitation alone is insufficient	Distinguish study and the maker's decision	Ancient rhetorical norm, not a talent measure
Quintilian, X.2.14–18	What to imitate and why it is good	Examine relationships, not pace alone	No study of this audio material
Quintilian, X.2.23–28	Suitability to circumstances and varied models	Examine a device in the workshop story	No single correct manner
Seneca, 84.5–9	Assimilation and the chorus image	Consider parts in a whole	No rule for concealing quotations or biological finding
Poe, opening and construction	Coordinating effect and means	Explain compositional decisions	Retrospective account of one poem

Primary sources

1. Quintilian. Institutio Oratoria X.2.1–28, translated by H. E. Butler, Loeb Classical Library Vol. IV, 1920; LacusCurtius. The complete chapter was read and the translator checked in the work index. This page is labelled not yet proofread. No complete-work or print-facsimile verification is claimed.

2. Seneca. Moral letters to Lucilius, Letter 84.1–13, translated by Richard M. Gummere; Wikisource. The complete letter was read. Contents place it in Vol. II, p. 276; this letter's precise physical imprint was not separately verified. Assimilation images are not treated as empirical theory.

3. Edgar Allan Poe. "The Philosophy of Composition," Graham's Magazine XXVIII, no. 4, April 1846, pp. 163–167; Poe Society, Text-02. The opening and construction through the discussion of combined metre and stanza on p. 166 were read; the ending is not used. The retrospective account is not independently verified here.

Short EN quotations were checked; RU renderings are United Wisdom's own. Historical text, translation, site and territorial rights remain distinct. No complete import permission or unrestricted use of contemporary works is asserted.

Tags

creativity, influence, imitation, personal voice, learning, audio story, composition, Quintilian, Seneca, Poe, reading, listening, form, material, authorship, attribution, quotation, exercise, choice, intonation, pause, narrative, independence, originality, observation, invention, collaboration, responsibility, traditions, United Wisdom

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 co-author 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.