

UNITED WISDOM

The Novel as an Experience of Another Life from Within

Meaning and Direction

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

P-19-N02 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

The Novel as an Experience of Another Life from Within

Epigraph

> *Experience is never limited, and it is never complete;*

Henry James, The Art of Fiction, opening clause of the experience passage; original English.

What this article is about

In conversation we hear words, notice a pause and see an action. A novel sometimes also gives us what a person does not say: hesitation before an answer, another person's interpretation of silence, several wishes that have not settled into a single decision. Reading can become an encounter with a different perspective, but the meaning of that encounter needs care. We have not lived someone else's life or acquired the right to explain an acquaintance through a favourite character. We are reading a composed text that chooses what to show, whose voice to admit and what to leave unknown. This article distinguishes participation in a literary scene, a supported interpretation of a character and knowledge of a living person. A particular Austen episode, James's account of a novelist's experience and Aristotle's distinction between possible and historical action provide different grounds. They promise neither better relationships nor automatic understanding, but invite attention to what is heard, imagined and still unknown.

I. A door that opens in the text

Imagine an ordinary scene: after a meeting, someone stays by a window instead of joining the conversation. An observer can list only what was visible. A novelist can show anticipation, an accidental memory, irritation at indecision or several incompatible thoughts. The motionless figure then acquires depth in time. Its position in the room no longer exhausts the scene. Yet that depth is produced by a way of telling. The reader has not discovered a real passer-by's secret store; the text invites a particular route of attention. The first question is therefore straightforward: what has actually been shown, and what have I added because the gesture resembles something in my own life? That distinction permits participation without claiming complete knowledge.

Participation need not involve an intense feeling. One reader follows the wording, another notices the sequence of actions, and a third remains unsure whom to believe. We can disagree with a character while seeing why a particular possibility became available at that moment. We

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

can understand the construction of a scene without experiencing a similar emotion. What matters here is distinguishing another position, rather than passing an examination in the correct emotional response. A book's failure to move us establishes no defect of character. Being moved does not by itself confirm an interpretation. Feeling and the grounds for judgment may support one another, but they do not automatically replace one another, either on the page or after the book is closed.

Living another life from within is a useful image for this participation, but becomes inaccurate if taken literally. We read for a limited time, can stop and return to our own surroundings. A character exists within an author's chosen sequence; a living person owes us no comparable access. The difference does not diminish the novel. It helps us notice its particular construction: access to an inward movement can be examined, discussed and compared with details of the text. We need not turn that access into a certificate of our own depth. We can simply identify the possibility of understanding opened by a scene and the passage supporting the observation, while allowing another reader to propose a different answer.

II. Narrator and interlocutor have different permissions

An author can make a thought available before a character has formulated it, or connect it with a memory unknown to everyone else in the scene. Within the work, this belongs to the accepted manner of telling. No equivalent general agreement exists in a conversation with a real person. We cannot point to an expressive look and declare a hidden thought established. Even familiarity does not turn a supposition into an inward sentence reliably heard from another consciousness. It helps to distinguish two statements: the text reports the character's fear; I think the person speaking to me was afraid. The second may be true, but requires its own grounds and remains open to correction by the person concerned.

An imagined example makes the difference clearer. A colleague declines an after-work gathering. In a novel we read, a similar refusal involved an old grievance, so that explanation comes first to mind. The colleague might instead have a scheduled call, a limited budget, another arrangement or simply no desire to attend. Listing possibilities still gives us no knowledge. It merely stops one convenient explanation from occupying the whole space. We can accept the refusal without investigating; where circumstances matter to shared work, we can ask an appropriate question. We cannot require the person to prove a right to decline by exposing an entire private history. This is a contemporary editorial boundary of conversation, not a doctrine that every novel must preach.

Reading may leave us with a question rather than an answer about somebody else. Have I mistaken silence for agreement? Did I leave room for my understanding to be corrected? Have I separated an action affecting shared work from a verdict on the whole person? These questions concern our own position as observers. They do not require us to imagine ourselves

into complete identity with another. Acknowledging the difference may make a conversation more precise: I see only part, memory offers an analogy, but the decision and explanation do not belong to me alone. The novel remains an occasion for a question. It becomes no evidence about a particular acquaintance and does not displace factual checking where facts matter.

III. One refusal and several readings of it

In chapter XXXII of Austen's Mansfield Park, Fanny's inward experience stands beside Sir Thomas's interpretation of her behaviour. The reader can see a discrepancy that a participant in the conversation does not sustain. This is a particular literary situation, not a model of all family relationships. For our question, what matters is the opportunity to see several levels together: what is said, what is observed, what narration supplies and what another character attributes. They need not be compressed into a single label. Isolating outward hesitation makes one reading plausible; following the inward movement changes its sufficiency. The difference comes from grounds offered by the text, not a right to know every quiet or dependent person better than they know themselves.

The historical setting matters too. Marriage, a place within a household and an older relative's judgment are connected differently here from an imagined contemporary gathering of colleagues. Removing those differences turns the novel into scenery for a ready-made thesis. Reading from within still means reading a particular world, not a pure feeling detached from circumstances. We can ask how refusal is heard under unequal conditions without declaring every conversation today a repetition of this chapter. A comparison should preserve both sides: a named detail of the work and a concrete circumstance of the present task. Where the second is absent, remaining with the book is preferable to assigning someone another person's plot and demanding the corresponding action.

Inward access does not oblige us to adopt every judgment a character makes. Knowledge, hope, fear and mistaken expectation can coexist in a text. Seeing that mixture means following the scene's development, rather than discovering an infallible representative of truth. We can respond to a particular difficulty while asking what information the character possesses and what remains missing. It is especially useful not to replace this question with a psychological type. A label can finish the work before the grounds of an action have been noticed. Our reading is bounded by the chosen chapter; it offers no complete verdict on the novel, every character or an historical system of relations. The limit gives the comparison precision rather than depriving it of meaning.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

IV. Whose voice names an inward life

A sentence about an experience can belong to a character, the narrator, a letter within the novel or our own retelling. These forms of access are not equivalent. A character may conceal something from themselves or an addressee; narration may reveal more or retain uncertainty; a reader's account selects what memory kept. Distinguishing them requires no specialist vocabulary. We can return to the paragraph and establish who is speaking, what event is being answered and what is actually named. A merely supposed thought should retain that status. A circumstance explicitly supplied by the text need not be made unknown for artificial complexity. Attentive reading holds both possibilities: trusting a given ground and noticing where its authority ends.

In a discussion, this distinction protects the conversation from premature certainty. Two readers may agree that a character left a room but understand the reason differently. The next step is to identify the passage supporting each interpretation. One may rely on an explicit explanation and the other on an earlier scene; both may have added personal experience. Disagreement need not immediately become defective taste or insufficient sensitivity. It becomes substantive when its object is visible: a detail, its significance, an overall judgment or a personal response. The last can be respected without making it prove authorial intention. A reader may name what affected them without presenting that response as the work's only permitted response.

An inward life created by a novel has a verbal form. A decisive difference may lie in a shift of tense, a qualification, an unanswered question or a repeated familiar word. Retelling can remove these features and leave a smooth explanation that the scene itself never supplied. Returning to the wording may therefore matter more than a confident conclusion about a character's personality. This requires no analysis of every line. Reading quickly for pleasure remains legitimate. But if a scene becomes the basis for a serious judgment about another person, it helps to check whether uncertainty disappeared in the transfer. Attention to form reminds us that inwardness is mediated even in fiction: it becomes accessible through selected words, their sequence and their connections.

V. Circumstances that cannot simply be removed

Another position is hard to examine if feeling is retained but the conditions of choice removed. A character may have little time, limited access to money, a family's judgment to consider or an unknown conversational outcome. The novel presents particular conditions; transferring them to our lives requires a new examination. We may recognise a question without receiving a ready-made solution. The importance of consent does not make every dependence identical; a wish to maintain a relationship does not erase the difference between a free request and a demand. Attention to circumstances resists calling a character simply strong or weak. It asks what possibilities were available, which were noticed and which a differently informed reader sees.

A constraint should also be distinguished from the absence of every possibility. A novel's narrow conditions do not warrant adding that every action was inevitable. Where choice is shown, its cost should not be treated as irrelevant. Both extremes simplify inward life. In an imagined contemporary scene, an employee may decline extra work while worrying about a relationship; a right to refuse does not describe the whole conversation. This neither negates the right nor proves consequences will occur. We can consider the request's form, the work involved and the available response without making someone an instance of a familiar literary conflict. Every further conclusion needs grounds distinct from the compelling analogy.

A material or historical detail can matter as much as an expressive reply. Who controls the room, arranges the meeting or learns about an event first? These questions give no universal key to a work, but clarify a character's position in a scene. For our own relationships the conclusion is modest: before explaining a decision through personal qualities, we can check relevant conditions. Checking does not mean demanding income details, family secrets or painful history. Clarifying a deadline, access to a place or the option to decline may suffice. Sometimes someone does not wish to explain, and that absence remains an absence. A novel may reveal the boundary without authorising us to cross it.

VI. Imagination works with an impression

The selected passage of James's Art of Fiction discusses a novelist's experience, imagination and accuracy of detail. It raises a question about a literary life emerging from a limited impression. Transferring that question to a reader is our editorial move, not the author's proven method. Readers also have memories, noticed details and an ability to supply what is unseen. Such additions may help a thought continue, but become no facts merely by being convincing. We distinguish creating a scene from reporting what happened. The former allows invention within a chosen form; the latter requires grounds appropriate to the claim. Imagination's strength does not erase the difference, however vivid the words become.

We can allow an imagined question without passing it off as another person's answer. Suppose we wonder how a request might sound at the end of a tiring day. This is not knowledge that our interlocutor is tired; it is a trial formulation with a named condition. It might suggest a clearer request and permission to postpone an answer, but establishes no hidden reason for refusal. A useful conditional scene can turn out to be unsuitable. A poor one quietly becomes an explanation somebody must defend themselves against. The wording reveals the difference: we can ask whether the time suits them instead of declaring their difficulty and building the conversation on unverified knowledge.

A literary impression and a factual report are checked differently. Discussion of a novel can consider a detail's relation to the whole, the plausibility of a transition, the voice and the sequence of actions. A report about a person needs to establish where information came from, what was observed and what they confirmed. An expressive scene need not satisfy the second inquiry. An accurate record need not create a literary effect. These differences let us value fiction without making it a document, and factual checking without calling it unimaginative. Reading may tempt us to tell somebody's story for them. A more careful option is to keep the impression as our own and leave room for something entirely different.

VII. The possible is not the historical

In Poetics IX, Aristotle distinguishes possible action according to probability or necessity from reporting what happened. This is a particular ancient account of poetry, not a complete modern theory of the novel. For our topic it raises a useful question about a story's status. A scene can coherently show how someone might act under given conditions without proving that a particular living person acted that way. Even an extraordinarily familiar character supplies no substitute for evidence. We can use a work to examine a possibility and stop there. Turning possibility into accusation, promise or biography requires new grounds. Without them, we know our interpretation of reading rather than another person's hidden truth.

The distinction matters especially when a literary analogy seems unusually successful. We recognise an acquaintance's gesture, a sequence of disagreements or hesitation before change. Recognition can be personally valuable but admits several explanations. The comparison may concern one detail; memory may have supplied a convenient image; the resemblance may disappear once significant differences are named. We can therefore ask not only how someone resembles a character but what fails to match: conditions, available decisions, spoken words and relations with others. The question does not destroy a literary response. It prevents that response quietly becoming a ready-made biography in which a real person has already been assigned a role and their next action written.

A novel loses no value by being denied the status of evidence. An imagined scene can place decisions side by side that we have not distinguished in our own task: remaining silent, asking,

postponing a conversation or declining participation. It can show one action acquiring different meanings under different circumstances. These possibilities remain material for thought, not compulsory instructions. We may choose another action or make no transfer at all. Reader and surrounding people retain their independence. Literary space broadens questions insofar as the text was actually considered; a number of books read establishes no quality of judgment. Naming a particular scene is more useful than declaring that literature has taught us to understand everyone.

VIII. Following a decision without cancelling its consequences

When narration follows a decision from within, an action can cease to look instantaneous. Waiting, an unsuccessful attempt to speak, a memory and postponement come before it. A reader may remain within that time, not yet knowing the next page even while anticipating a turn of plot. Staying beside an unfinished decision is a particular experience of reading. We notice not only the result but a nearby possibility that never occurred. This does not make the narrated action right. Its consequences may remain serious and its explanation insufficient. But separating movement from outcome permits a more precise discussion: what somebody tried to do within the scene, and what their action actually changed there.

Understanding grounds is not identical with approving an action. We may follow a wish's emergence while rejecting its use to justify interference in another life. We can see the circumstances of an error without requiring forgiveness from the person affected. Literary discussion allows double attention: to one character's inward sequence and to what occurred for another. Seen only through the chosen consciousness, everyone else can become an obstacle or instrument in its story. A changed question restores their place: what actions concern them, what did they answer, what is reported about their position and what remains outside the text? An absent perspective can itself be discussed without inventing missing testimony.

In life, the distinction leaves room for explanation and a boundary. We can hear why an agreement failed without agreeing to repeat it unchanged. We can acknowledge missing circumstances without making consequences disappear. This concerns ordinary interaction, not a way to handle danger through a literary model. Someone may not wish to discuss painful experience through a book, and that is enough. Refusing the discussion is no refusal of depth. Establishing an action, deadline or end of participation may matter more than jointly interpreting an inward life. The novel remains a cultural experience; it does not govern people's choices beyond the page.

IX. Readers bring their own lives

A composed scene meets a reader's memory on the page. One phrase recalls a conversation, another arouses distrust, a third seems unexpectedly precise. These responses belong to reading, but not all are statements about the work. Saying that a scene reminded us of an occasion differs from claiming the author described exactly that occasion and proved its meaning. The distinction preserves personal response without taking possession of the text. It also matters among readers: another's association may be interesting without being shared. To continue, we may only need to name where a cited detail ends and personal memory begins. Nobody must disclose an association's particulars when they prefer to keep them private.

Another position may have an unfamiliar pace. What looks like empty delay to us may involve the cost of answering within the scene; a decision we would make quickly may not yet have a clear form for a character. A novel lets us follow that time without immediately correcting its inhabitant. We can notice a reply changing meaning after the next paragraph, or return to discover that an initial impression relied on an incomplete scene. This experience need not become a claim that every slow real-world answer deserves unlimited patience. Within reading, however, it permits an explanation to remain unfinished. Interest may begin where a work departs from our habitual order of questions.

Not every novel or reading offers the same experience. A work may be stylised, comic, fantastic, centred on event or language; a reader may seek rest, suspense or beauty of form. None must be judged by a single promise of inward relocation. Our sources discuss different grounds of literary action, not an established programme of beneficial reading for everyone. A book may remain a cultural encounter without a personal report of transformation. We need recognise neither ourselves nor any acquaintance in its characters. A precise phrase, clear detail or disagreement can be a concrete result of meeting a text. It need not be promoted into a general verdict on our inner worth.

X. After the last page

Returning to ordinary life may begin with a small distinction. Before reading, we named an action with one word; now we see different circumstances that could alter its meaning. This is not knowledge of a particular person, but a question about our own explanation. We can retain it without immediate action, check a relevant fact, clarify a request or abandon an unnecessary interpretation. Any action should answer the present situation, not reproduce a literary scene. Nobody owes us behaviour confirming the value of our book. Nor must readers prove that they read correctly by changing a relationship or making a difficult decision immediately after the ending.

The novel's encounter with another inward life remains valuable without that report. While reading, we followed a sequence of attention absent from a brief account of the event. We noticed waiting, a qualification, an unrealised possibility or the difference between what was said and understood. We can name that sequence without taking possession of a character's fate, discuss it without seeking identical feelings, or keep it in memory without making it a guide. Literary participation remains participation, connected with a text, our work of reading and its limited time. This grants no right to speak for a living person. It may generate a more attentive question about how we already speak about them.

The boundary does not close the door; it clarifies where it leads. Through a novel we can enter a composed way of seeing life, follow its construction and return with a question. No particular question, or even its persistence, is guaranteed. Yet we can distinguish attentive following from appropriation: name textual grounds, preserve differences of circumstance, admit incompleteness and let another person correct our account. The inward experience of reading then does not replace conversation, but remains a cultural possibility beside it. Another life owes us no transparency. Precision may begin in acknowledging that something on the page mattered while the person before us retains the right to differ from what we have imagined.

What this means in practice

Choose a short scene you would like to discuss and reread it in available context. Name separately an action or reply, an inward experience explicitly reported and your own supposition. Every position need not be filled: the text may retain an unknown. Identify who speaks and where the grounds appear. This concerns a particular passage, rather than testing sensitivity or requiring one prescribed reading of the novel.

If a comparison with ordinary life arises, name one matching detail and one significant difference. A fictional refusal might recall declining a gathering, while conditions, relationships and available information differ. Ask what clarification actually concerns the present task. Accepting the answer without explanation may suffice. No painful personal history, unwanted contact or assignment of a character's role to an acquaintance is required.

You can finish with two statements: in the text I saw this; about the real person I know only this. A question may remain between them. If action seems appropriate, choose something proportionate to current circumstances: check a deadline, clarify a question or preserve a refusal. Simply continuing to read is also possible. The trial guarantees nothing and replaces no specialised help; its purpose is to distinguish a scene, a supposition and a conversation.

Key quotation

> *you are quite mistaken.*

Jane Austen, Mansfield Park XXXII, second utterance in the paragraph beginning You are mistaken, sir; original-English fragment.

Connections between traditions

1. **Access and attribution.** Austen's Mansfield Park XXXII, the account of Sir Thomas's conversation and Fanny's reply (carrier 2423–2431), distinguishes inward experience from attribution. James's Art of Fiction, on reality coloured by an author's vision (1703–1705), relates literary conviction to composition. Both raise the question of access to another position. The thematic consequence is to distinguish textual access from an observer's own conclusion. The grounds differ: Austen creates a particular scene; James discusses a novelist's work. Neither passage verifies guesses about a living interlocutor.

2. **The observed and the supplied.** Austen XXXII distinguishes silence from inward movement in 2421–2432. James continues his account of experience and imagination in 1705–1711. In both, the visible need not exhaust a scene's possible content. The mechanism is to avoid confusing a narrative addition with an established fact. Their grounds remain different: literary presentation and a critical defence of an author's possibilities. A living person's right to correct an interpretation is a contemporary editorial boundary here, not an inference that imagination provides evidence of motives.

3. **Possibility and evidence.** Poetics IX opens by distinguishing possible action from what happened (149–150); James does not abolish accuracy of detail in literary work (1712–1715). Comparing them retains two questions: is a possibility coherently composed, and what supports a particular report? The article distinguishes an imagined position from knowledge of a real biography. Aristotle's ancient distinction between poetry and history is not James's theory of the novel; James's literary accuracy does not replace contemporary factual checking. Neither supplies a real person's unspoken explanation.

4. **The cost of answering and conditions of action.** Austen XXXII, 2461–2472, places difficulty in answering within a particular relationship. Poetics IX, 149–153, considers action through probability or necessity. The shared question is whether naming an action suffices without examining the connections making it intelligible. The thematic bridge moves from a label to a scene's conditions. Their grounds differ: a specific inward sequence and an account of constructed action. No psychological type, inevitable real-world decision or duty to excuse consequences follows.

5. **The whole and a chosen detail.** James, 1716–1718, discusses selecting detail and connected forms of expression. Poetics IX, 154–156, considers episodic sequence and effect within tragic construction. These grounds invite a question about a detail detached from its scene. Here the consequence is returning to context before declaring an inward experience explained. The artistic programmes differ: tragic effect governs no universal form of the novel. Their comparison promises no particular effect of reading on a person and provides no empirical account of readers.

6. **Complexity without a finished label.** Austen XXXII places different meanings within one relationship in the fire and gratitude paragraphs (2493–2495). James questions a simple recipe for literary reality in 1703–1704. The mechanism is noticing details that resist an initial explanation. Readers can participate in an inward scene without reducing somebody to one quality. Yet fictional complexity and a novelist's critical position establish neither the goodness of every relationship nor a duty of gratitude for pressure. Contemporary judgments of consent and safety remain separate.

Primary sources

1. Jane Austen. Mansfield Park, chapter XXXII, original English; the carrier heading records 1814. The complete selected chapter, carrier 2396–2512, was read; adjacent boundaries supply context only. Key fragment: 2430. No whole-novel reading is claimed here.

2. Henry James. The Art of Fiction, XI in Partial Portraits; Macmillan 1894 carrier, first collection edition 1888. The continuous selected passage 1699–1718 concerns experience, imagination and detail; the epigraph opens the sentence at 1705. Original English, not a translation. Neither the whole essay nor collection was read for this article.

3. Aristotle. Poetics, IX, historical S. H. Butcher English translation. The complete chapter, 149–156, was read for the distinction between possible action and history; no direct quote is used. The Greek original was not collated.

The short Russian quotations are United Wisdom's own translations from the named English originals. Comparisons remain within these passages: a fictional scene, critical argument and ancient poetics retain different grounds.

Tags

novel, reading, literature, another life, inward life, perspective, narrator, character, imagination, experience, Jane Austen, Mansfield Park, Henry James, Aristotle, Poetics, detail, context, possibility, history, judgment, supposition, consent, refusal, conversation, attention, cultural experience, interpretation, boundaries, meaning, autonomy

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.