


UNITED WISDOM

# An imagined interlocutor as a way to change perspective

Human Nature and Inner World

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

I-21-N02 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

# An imagined interlocutor as a way to change perspective

## Epigraph

> *within myself*

Boethius, The Consolation of Philosophy, I.1. H. R. James, Elliot Stock1897, Gutenberg14328, displayed line189. The opening of a literary and philosophical scene, rather than evidence of a separate inner adviser.

## What this article is about

An organiser writes an announcement for a meeting in a familiar room. Everything seems clear: the location is familiar, and the team knows the starting time. Then the organiser invents an imaginary new participant and records the questions: which entrance should I use, what does participation cost, and what happens if I arrive after the start? Some information really is missing from the announcement. The imagined reply was not a real person's answer. It helped its author formulate questions for the text; the address and conditions still require checking. In this imagined scene, changing perspective supplies a subject for work without establishing someone else's mind.

That distinction is central. An imagined interlocutor can be a form of personal writing, a literary device, or a way of considering reasons. It does not become a separate source of facts, consent, or authority. We will compare selected philosophical texts and a complete primary-research abstract without presenting them as validation of the proposed exercise. The question is not how vividly a voice was imagined. What matters is what the new form made noticeable, which information is missing, and where a participant's actual answer is needed. The invented conversation retains its author, task, and possibility of ending without compulsory inner agreement.



@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

# I. Perspective is defined by the question rather than a convincing character

We can begin with a simple task: view the announcement as someone visiting this place for the first time. This condition sets available information rather than a biography. Such a participant does not know the room's internal name, the customary entrance, or the team's agreement about price. The author can ask which parts of the message are clear without this knowledge. Age, character, and voice need not first be invented. A difference in information suffices for this work. It makes the subject concrete: what the text says and what the author adds through familiarity with a place that the new reader does not share.

An imaginary perspective can also be expressed without a character. Writing three questions for the announcement, giving the text to another reader, or checking it against required information are possible alternatives. The imagined interlocutor is not prescribed as a necessary stage of development. A person chooses a convenient form for the present work. If the role distracts from the task, it can be abandoned. That refusal indicates neither a lack of imagination nor closed-mindedness. The usefulness of the particular note depends on what was noticed and checked, rather than maintaining an attractive conversation with a name, personality, and expressive intonation.

A role can be named through its relationship to the task. A new participant, someone without the earlier email, or a reader of the short version are sufficiently precise possibilities. A naive visitor or perpetually dissatisfied customer adds an assessment in advance. These labels may orient the author towards defence or mockery before considering the question. The label can be removed while the informational limit remains. A question about price then concerns a missing condition rather than a supposedly unpleasant personality. This is an editorial choice of wording, not a claim that any particular word inevitably produces one psychological reaction in everyone.

The author's intention also matters. If the intention is to check clarity, the imaginary reader asks about information. If it is to defend a decision from every objection, a role can easily be assigned convenient weak replies. Honesty is not proven by naming an exercise. But the procedure can be considered: does a question permit correction, or serve only to confirm a chosen conclusion? In our scene, the new perspective revealed missing entrance and price information. That limited result suffices. It does not make the organiser someone who now knows every future visitor's needs precisely and can answer on their behalf.

## II. A literary figure does not become a clinical mentor

In the selected opening of The Consolation of Philosophy, Boethius presents personified Philosophy appearing beside the narrator and their subsequent conversation. Selected primary passages of Book I were read, rather than the whole work. Medical images belong to the historical philosophical text, not contemporary treatment validation. James, Book I.

For our comparison, what matters is that a question can be expressed through meeting a character. This does not make every contemporary imagined interlocutor equivalent to Boethius's Philosophy. The work has its own composition, content, and position; the announcement's author has a narrow task concerning entrance and conditions. A literary form invites consideration of a way of writing without transferring historical wisdom to a new character. If we invent a mentor and give that figure a confident sentence, its grounds have not strengthened. They still depend on the reasoning, information, and choice of the person composing the present reply.

Retaining context guards against overly convenient reading. At the book's beginning, the figure speaks sternly and uses her own assessments. Every intonation should not be transferred into contemporary practice as though harshness automatically deepened an inner question. In our work, a calm formulation can be selected: what is missing from the announcement? It need not humiliate its author for an omission. This is a contemporary editorial decision, rather than a claim that we corrected a historical text or found a universal norm of the entire philosophical tradition. The comparison remains limited to the form of a question, preserving different content and circumstances.

If a person likes the image of a wise teacher, it can be identified as a created image. The wisdom of a name does not replace checking a proposed action. A role may repeat the author's favourite idea, get a fact wrong, or add nothing. These are possible outcomes of a writing device. Its dignity need not be defended at the cost of a factual error. In the opening scene, a mentor declaring the entrance obvious does not remove a missing address. The reply can be corrected or abandoned. An expressive character has no independent authority to decide that a future person already has sufficient information.

## III. Question and answer are not yet knowledge

In the selected Theaetetus statement, Socrates describes thinking through conversation, question, answer, and opinion while identifying limited understanding. These are a character's words in a philosophical dialogue, rather than a transcript or contemporary universal psychological theory. Jowett, selected primary context.

A cautious question follows for writing today: what status does an answer receive when I formulate it myself? It may be a reason, hypothesis, or decision. The appearance of a second reply does not make it independent evidence. If the organiser asks an imaginary participant about cost and supplies the answer that participation is free, the price has not yet been checked. There is a condition to learn through an actual agreement. Dialogue made the gap visible without filling it with a fact. This boundary preserves conversation as a form of reflection without forcing it to perform the work of an external informational source.

We can distinguish a question for our text from one about a real person. Where is the entrance identified is something available to inspect. Will a particular acquaintance enjoy the meeting is a question for which the text and personal imagination provide insufficient grounds. That second hypothesis need not be forbidden; it can be named as a hypothesis, and a real conversation considered. Yet the distinction does not disappear because one imaginary character wrote both questions. The form brings the note together without unifying sources for answers or assigning every reply equal reliability or an identical checking procedure.

Uncertainty is permissible inside the exercise. The imaginary interlocutor may ask, and the author may write that no answer is available yet. This is meaningful when a substantial gap is found. The role need not know more than the person. A question can be put to organisers, a document checked, or a condition left open until information arrives. Dialogue need not end in complete explanation. Its limits do not make the exercise a failure; they prevent inventing an answer merely for an attractive finished page, a consistent character, or a feeling that a ready-made solution to every task already exists inside.

## IV. Give the role limited access to information

When checking an announcement, it helps to define what the imaginary reader has seen: only today's text or also an earlier email. If the author silently gives the role all their knowledge, the questions lose their original subject. The reader immediately knows the entrance and the agreed price because the organiser knows them. The task's conditions can be restored: only the saved message is considered. Missing information then becomes literally visible. We do not claim the role precisely reproduces every new participant. It represents an informational limit chosen for today's editing and preparation of an actual invitation.

The limit should apply to answers as well. If the role has not received the timetable, it need not guess it through the announcement's tone. If a price is visible, payment conditions can be questioned, but the role does not determine the organiser's precise thoughts about money. Complex biography is unnecessary. Questions follow from information available in the selected scene. This procedure keeps perspective functional rather than making it an imagined trial of everyone's motives. A person can notice a gap in a message without claiming to have uncovered the personalities of those who wrote it or will read it.

Two different imaginary readers may sometimes be useful. One knows the address; the other encounters the room's name for the first time. They are not competing to be the most authentic visitor. They show different requirements for clarity within the question. The same announcement can be considered to see where the team's knowledge is necessary for understanding. The author then decides which information belongs in the text and which is available through a separate link. The decision remains editorial. Two created roles are not two independent research participants and provide no statistical ground for a percentage of the audience that now understands everything.

An informational limit should not become an excuse for caricature. A new participant can ask precise, reasonable questions without being helpless to demonstrate the author's care. A strong comment can be formulated: the centre's name is given, but the building has two entrances; which one is used? The answer then concerns an actual condition. The role is unnecessary for proving superiority. If its question improves on the initial text, that is a reason to correct the text. The author participates in correction without turning an omission into a general assessment of competence, dignity, or attitude towards people.

## V. Research does not promise accurate imaginary reading of a person

The complete abstract of Eyal, Steffel, and Epley's 2018 study reports no consistent accuracy improvement from instructions to adopt another's perspective in the tested tasks; direct conversation is considered separately. Full methods and text were not read here. This neither tests our written role nor universally prohibits imagination. Primary-paper abstract.

This limit is especially relevant when an author wants the exercise to become knowledge about an acquaintance. I imagined what they would say describes personal work. I received their answer is another assertion. An actual answer requires an appropriate source. The abstract helps avoid promising accuracy through a change of position alone, but does not determine every present outcome. We calculate no probability of the reader's error or declare every imaginary question useless. In the opening scene, usefulness was narrow: information really was missing from the announcement. That can be checked by reading the text, rather than matching a particular person's secret thought.

The scientific reading's limits also need retaining. Bibliography and abstract do not replace the entire design, data, and analysis. Independent replication, investigation of today's audience, and validation of the proposed practice are not presented here. These results remain unclaimed. The source is included for the identified question about prediction accuracy and obtaining new information. The rest is editorial reasoning. A reader need not consider every ethical formulation an experimental finding merely because a scientific link is nearby.

Attribution makes visible where the research authors speak and where we propose a way to consider our own text.

A real conversation also does not make everything instantly transparent. A person may reply briefly, not yet know a decision, or decline to discuss a subject. That particular answer and its limit are then available. Imagination should not be contrasted with a fairy-tale promise that one question reveals someone entirely. For our task, correspondence suffices: an invented reply remains created; a real reply is received from a participant; a checked condition is confirmed through an appropriate source. This procedure permits the unknown and action through available information without demanding everyone's complete inner transparency for the author's final certainty.

## VI. Give the discovered question an appropriate check

The imaginary participant asks what the meeting costs. The organisers' actual agreement can be checked, and the price or explicitly free participation included. A pleasant answer cannot simply be selected and left in the announcement. If the condition is undecided, this can be stated or publication can await clarification where possible. We establish no universal procedure for every event. We name a subject relevant to the present message. The role found a question; confirming cost remains separate work with its own source, date, and limit, regardless of how convincingly the conversation was written.

A question about the entrance is checked through the place or a responsible participant's answer. If the building has two entrances, the selected entrance needs clarification. If no such difference exists, the question's initial version changes. The exercise permits this outcome. Every invented objection need not be retained as correct. We can record that clarification was performed and extra instructions are unnecessary. The role then helped formulate a check without discovering an established error. This limited result is more honest than declaring every question proof of a hidden defect in the initial text or newly deep understanding.

Sometimes a question concerns preference: would a later start be convenient? If a real audience is available and the decision is actually being discussed, participants can be asked. If no conversation occurred, an imaginary role does not replace it. The author may choose a time through existing obligations, identifying the decision's grounds. There should be no claim that every future visitor consented because an imaginary character approved the timetable. A personal choice can be legitimate and reasonable without fictitious unanimity. What matters is the participation actually required by agreements, rather than receiving complete confirmation of every detail from every conceivable person.

For editorial checking, an outcome named in advance suffices. The full address is given, the entrance confirmed, the price agreed, and late-arrival rules formulated. If these are retained in

a new version, it can be compared with the original. There is no need to measure an inner image's vividness or declare a qualitative personality shift. This is a text changed according to checked conditions. A wider result, understanding by a real audience, would require separate observation. It is not automatically achieved. Useful preparation can finish while preserving differences between a prepared announcement, a participant receiving it, and actual experience at the meeting.

## VII. Another perspective does not give a group one personality

A condition concerning access to a message can be checked: the reader saw only a short card, did not open a link, or received forwarded text without an explanation. These are particular information-transfer situations. They provide no ground for defining the character of everyone reading this way. For the announcement's author, what matters is which information disappeared and where it can be placed. The new question concerns a message. It does not become a diagnosis of audience attentiveness or a story that a particular group naturally always misunderstands, is lazy or anxious, or needs special constant explanations of every ordinary action.

If access to the venue is involved, the factual condition should be established directly. An imaginary visitor does not prove an entrance is convenient for everyone with different mobility needs. Stairs, a lift, and actual instructions can be checked where relevant to the task. A group should not be assigned one shared experience or a predetermined preference. Available information is better reported literally while leaving room for questions. No full accessibility investigation is presented here. We simply avoid replacing a missing check with an expressive role's reply created from the author's assumptions and mistaken for someone else's experience.

Several perspectives may indicate different tasks rather than one compulsory redesign. A short-version reader needs the address on the card. Someone planning the whole evening needs duration and possible late-arrival information. The author can decide how to organise information through the format and actual meeting conditions. Not every imagined request must be met. Yet refusal also has grounds: limited space, an unagreed rule, or the selected format. It does not require declaring a visitor wrong. The limit of a message or proposal can be communicated without an imagined story about the inferior level of people it does not suit.

Changing perspective can end with acknowledging diversity. One announcement need not answer every possible question, but should contain what matters for the identified participation. Further clarification can be offered through an appropriate route if it actually exists. An available contact should not be promised when no one responds there. A role helps consider a question; the author's work concerns actual information and real obligations. This distinction preserves choice for both the message's creator and a future participant. Neither is

obliged to become the single personality the author's imagination once assigned to an entire audience.

## VIII. A name or voice creates neither consent nor another's authority

For a private draft, someone may imagine conversation with an acquaintance or an image of a favourite author. The text should nevertheless retain its origin: a created reply rather than a received statement. A familiar name does not make it project approval. If an answer matters to a shared agreement, the real participant is needed. If a historical author is cited, an actual text and appropriate context are needed. We do not claim every use of an image is prohibited. We preserve the differences between a creative device, a hypothesis, a checked quotation, and permission that a person actually gave.

It is especially important not to pass a created dialogue along as though its interlocutor participated. The reader should understand where there is a literary scene, a draft hypothesis, or genuine correspondence. A real name can be replaced with a functional role if identity is irrelevant to the task. This does not impoverish a question about entrance or price. If a name matters to an imaginative work, its use remains an authorial choice with its own context, rather than a way to obtain another person's consent to a factual message. The article does not establish rights for every external use of a person's identity; it identifies the present record's origin and limits.

A role may sound caring yet propose an unsupported conclusion, or sound stern yet ask a useful question. Content and grounds are considered rather than presumed kindness or wisdom of a voice. The person retains the right not to follow advice. A created mentor gains no authority to prescribe treatment, reveal an acquaintance's secret motive, or release the author from responsibility for action. If an exercise belongs to another scope of help, its requirements remain separate. In our editorial scene, checking a message is enough; no general trial of the organiser's or reader's personality is needed.

The writer retains the right to end the conversation. One substantial question may be enough, without making every invented role agree. They are not independent participants who must be persuaded for permission to continue living. If the form becomes inconvenient, an ordinary list, pause, or real discussion of the task can replace it. The article establishes no therapeutic effect and diagnoses no person through their relationship to an exercise. Personal material may remain private. Authorship means both creating replies and deciding their application, audience, and next action.

## IX. The outcome is visible in the task rather than one voice's victory

The organiser added checked entrance and price information while leaving late-arrival rules for clarification. This can be named today's result. The imaginary interlocutor need not now praise the text. It is enough to know which conditions are confirmed and which question remains open. If a real visitor later asks about another detail, the announcement can be corrected. This does not prove changing perspective was pointless. Preparation was limited, as stated. A new answer participates in further work without protecting the previous role's perfection or declaring the questioner an inconvenient exception.

Useful clarification can be distinguished from pleasant inner completion. The author felt calm after the conversation: a description of a state. The text contains the correct address: a checkable result. They may coincide, but one does not replace the other. Someone can remain uncertain while retaining accurate information, or feel confident without noticing an invented price. The appropriate check matters to this task. No compulsory calm or special intonation of correct decision is assigned. A state has its place without automatically certifying every factual condition in a message or another person's participation.

After completion, it is enough to retain the new version and grounds for substantial changes. A detailed transcript of the entire imaginary conversation is not always necessary. The question, answer source, and corrected text can remain. If the author wants to keep the scene for creativity, it receives its own status. These are two different outcomes, each potentially meaningful. Editing need not become a story of inner transformation. In the opening situation, a clear task was performed: invitation information was considered through missing knowledge and clarified where actual conditions and answers made that possible.

The imagined interlocutor remains one available way to formulate another question. Philosophical texts helped reveal the form and its limits; the abstract helped avoid promising accuracy through a position change alone. The real participant retained their answer, and the author retained responsibility for the text. Perspective changes insofar as the considered question changes, rather than through appropriation of someone else's mind. Writing, checking, asking, and finishing are possible. The exercise's meaning remains proportionate work on a particular task, rather than finding an ultimate inner mentor who supposedly knows everything and authorises every subsequent action.

## What this means in practice

Choose one text or decision and define what information the imaginary interlocutor has. For an announcement, this could be a new participant who saw only the short message. The role needs no biography. Ordinary questions can replace it if more convenient.

Write one strong question without an evaluative label. Separate missing information from an assumption about someone's mood or character. An imagined reply remains your formulation rather than an independent answer. If there is no answer, retain the gap and name a source that can actually be consulted.

Check the factual condition through appropriate information. Clarify price, entrance, or agreement where relevant. Real consent requires a real participant. A historical name and convincing voice do not certify invented permission. A creative dialogue may be retained while identified as a created text.

Name the limited outcome and finish when the task has been sufficiently considered. A prepared message does not mean checked experience of the entire audience. In the opening scene, confirmed information can be added and an open condition left for clarification. The exercise is voluntary; an effect is not promised. Another person may give a new answer, and the author may correct a version without defending an imaginary interlocutor's infallibility.

## Key quotation

> *scarcely understand*

Plato, Theaetetus, Socrates's statement in the selected primary context. Benjamin Jowett, Gutenberg1726, displayed line1739. The character's qualification is not turned into the author's complete theory or proof of the present exercise's accuracy.

## Connections between traditions

| Comparison | Question it opens | Boundary |
|---|---|---|
| Boethius I ↔ a created role | How does a question become a meeting scene? | Personified Philosophy is not a contemporary clinical mentor. |
| Plato ↔ our own answer | What status does a formulated opinion have? | A character's reply is no independent factual source. |
| Primary research ↔ presumed perspective | What new information was actually obtained? | Complete abstract, not methods/text; exercise unvalidated. |
| Functional role ↔ real participant | What does the imaginary reader know and the person answer? | An informational condition is not a group's personality; imagination is not consent. |
| Editorial check ↔ completion | What changed and which question remains? | Vividness/confidence does not replace confirmation; no effect promised. |

The map is editorial, not proof of one teaching or historical influence. The everyday scene is imagined; ending does not depend on every created role agreeing.

## Primary sources

1. Boethius, The Consolation of Philosophy, selectedBookI. H. R. James, LondonElliotStock1897, Gutenberg14328. Header/title0–55, selected primary proseI188–195, II236–239, III255–263, and openingIV288–292 actually read, rather than the entire work. JamesPreface/proem/summary distinguished from primary text. Selected fragment's print page unestablished; international rights UNKNOWN.

2. Plato, Theaetetus, selectedprimarydialogue. BenjaminJowett, Gutenberg1726; header/translator read earlier in current-batch I38. Selected primary1715–1789 read here, especially1739–1741; not the whole dialogue. Translator introduction is not Plato's speech; Socrates speaks as a character. Print date/page unestablished; international rights UNKNOWN.

3. Tal Eyal, Mary Steffel, Nicholas Epley, Perspective mistaking. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology2018Apr114(4),547–571; DOI10.1037/pspa0000115. Complete abstract244–248 and bibliography177–193 actually read; full methods/data/text NOT_READ. Steffel's publication list, entry104, verifies bibliography. APAfulltext and authorPDF were actually inaccessible on attempts and are not claimed as read. International rights UNKNOWN; neither a universal result for everyone nor our note's effect is claimed.

Sources read05October2026; no complete import. One ledger counts short direct fragments across languages and files, including shared Theaetetus use in I38. Sujato/SuttaCentral and mirrors are excluded. Historical text, research abstract, and editorial proposals have different grounds.

## Tags

imagined interlocutor, perspective, question, answer, role, information, announcement, participant, text, editing, Boethius, Philosophy, James, Plato, Theaetetus, Jowett, Eyal, Steffel, Epley, abstract, checking, condition, agreement, consent, authorship, hypothesis, accessibility, responsibility, boundaries, UNKNOWN

## About the authors

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

Maria Evilkut is a coauthor of United Wisdom. Alongside 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.