

UNITED WISDOM

Stories of Return in Literature and Our Own Lives

Meaning and Direction

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

P-19-N05 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Stories of Return in Literature and Our Own Lives

Epigraph

> *he was lost, and is found.*

— Luke 15:24, part of the father’s declaration in the parable of two sons. King James Version; a religious image, not a medical description.

What this article is about

Return is easily imagined as movement backwards: someone enters a familiar house again, meets people from before, or opens an abandoned undertaking. Yet a recognisable place cannot restore elapsed time, and an old name for a relationship does not establish its present terms. Literature helps make this difference visible. This article considers a selected recognition scene in the Odyssey, Luke’s parable of two sons, and concluding passages from Jane Austen’s Persuasion. Epic divine action, the parable’s religious meaning and the novel’s social world remain different grounds. Comparing them promises neither reconciliation, restored health nor mandatory growth after absence. Contemporary situations below are imagined illustrations, not research cases. The question is what someone calls a return: presence, renewed participation, recognition by another person, or a way of describing their own history. Something important can be approached again without requiring everyone to become who they once were, or treating familiarity as sufficient ground for renewed agreement.

I. What exactly has returned

The same verb describes different events. We can return to a town, a conversation, an activity, a promise, or an idea of ourselves. Location can establish the first; it cannot establish the others. Someone attends a group meeting again without yet knowing its revised rules. They reopen an old manuscript without having to continue it in the former way. Meeting an acquaintance does not automatically restore intimacy. “Returned” therefore needs an object and scale: where am I present, what am I participating in again, and what has actually resumed? Such precision does not diminish the event. It releases it from consequences not yet established.

Return also belongs to more than one participant. For someone arriving, it may have begun during the journey; for someone who remained, it begins with an unexpected message or

appearance. Their timing and knowledge differ. The returning person has an account of absence; the other has experience of life without them. Neither account becomes a complete shared history merely by being earlier or more detailed. Each can have a subject of their own without an identical evaluation of separation. This editorial distinction makes a recognition scene more legible: who knows, who assumes, who is ready to acknowledge an event, and who first needs to understand it?

In a biography, the word can expand further: “I have finally returned to myself.” It may accurately express someone’s experience without requiring external proof of one uniquely authentic self. A particular conversation can ask what the phrase means: time for reading has reappeared, freer speech has become possible, or participation has been chosen again. These are different matters with their own conditions. This article supplies no test of personal authenticity. It keeps an expressive image from becoming an instruction to prove that an entire former self has been restored. Naming the important connection actually approached again can be enough, while other parts remain open to description.

II. Recognition is not immediate agreement

In the selected sequence of Odyssey XXIII, Penelope does not accept news of return as ready knowledge. She sees someone, hears others, and needs signs by which recognition becomes possible. Samuel Butler’s translation makes appearance, surrounding pressure and the account of the marriage bed particularly distinct. This is no contemporary instruction for testing a partner. The scene belongs to an epic world of divine action, household hierarchy and violence, none of which is adopted as a modern norm. Its narrower relevance is structural: recognition arises through information meaningful to a particular shared history, rather than merely through a demand to acknowledge the person who has returned.

The reader’s position creates another difficulty. We may know what a character does not yet know, making caution look like needless delay. Reader knowledge is not the character’s knowledge. Imagine friends assuming that a former group member is ready to work under the old agreement again. That person has only come to discuss possibilities. If observers replace the person’s words with their own certainty, return becomes an obligation already assigned. What is needed is a question addressed to the participant, rather than only an account of how long everyone waited. Waiting matters to those who waited, but does not establish someone’s present readiness for a particular role.

Recognition and agreement also differ where identity is unquestioned. We know who stands before us without knowing which terms they currently accept. Memories of closeness cannot answer that question. Someone can recognise an acquaintance, welcome the encounter, and still decline to resume a particular relationship. In the literary scene, signs establish recognition of a husband; the imagined situation concerns a present form of participation. These are

different tasks, so direct identification would be inaccurate. The comparison instead highlights a missing link between appearance and conclusion: on what ground do we call this a return of the particular thing we believe has returned?

III. A former place does not preserve former time

A familiar room can seem to promise constancy: the table is where it was, a familiar sound comes through the window, and a few objects remain. Space and time nevertheless answer different questions. People may have new responsibilities, less time to meet, or a changed understanding of an earlier conversation. Even outward continuity cannot subtract absence from a shared history. This is no law that every return must disappoint. Familiar details can be genuinely welcome. Their survival simply cannot prove that every relationship and possibility survived too. An object can look the same while occupying a different place in the present arrangement of life.

Imagine someone reopening a workshop for an ordinary amateur activity after several years. Remembering how quickly familiar work once proceeded, they initially measure the present day only by that standard. Tools, available time and rules for shared space have changed. Those conditions need clarification before deciding what to continue. This invented scene offers no study of skills or health. Its point is that returning to an activity can mean encountering its conditions anew rather than switching on a former mode. The activity's value need not disappear because participation begins modestly, requires an explanation, or takes a different form suited to what is now possible.

A connection with the past can survive through something other than repetition. An old letter still records a particular relationship even when such a letter could not be written now. Unfinished work can suggest an important question without becoming an obligatory debt. A familiar object can recall someone without requiring an entire household to be organised around it again. Choosing that connection needs no final verdict on whether the person has become better or worse. It concerns a particular object's present significance. "Why have I not returned as I was?" can sometimes become a more precise question: what genuinely matters to preserve, and what am I repeating only to make two moments look alike?

IV. The person receiving also participates

In Luke 15:11–32, the younger son's return includes more than deciding to rise and come back. The father sees him, goes towards him and receives him. Another participant's action cannot silently become a result the returning person produced alone. This is also a religious parable, rather than an agreement prescribing an identical response from every family. Its lost-and-found language retains its particular meaning; it is no medical account of death and revival. The literary question concerns two actions: one person arrives and another responds. Their relationship cannot be fully described through one side's inward plan or through physical arrival alone.

Everyday speech can build a desired reception into return in advance, as though everyone already knows why the meeting matters now. Others may lack information, have different plans, or remember separation differently. This does not automatically make them indifferent. Our wish can be communicated without declaring it shared. In an imagined example, a former reading-group member asks whether there is space at the next meeting and how discussion is now arranged. This acknowledges that the shared form continued without them. It neither humiliates the returning person nor requires those who remained to confirm a former role simply to produce an attractive gesture of hospitality.

The receiving person need not say one large yes or no to the entire history. They can agree to meet without agreeing to the former frequency of contact, offer a role without restoring former authority, or warmly answer a letter without promising future intimacy. Each agreement has an object. Such clarity differs from concealed conditions revealed only after an obligation has been placed on someone. Conditions should be as definite as present knowledge permits. This editorial boundary does not reinterpret the parable as a negotiation protocol: its religious image of welcome and the practical arrangement of an ordinary encounter remain different levels connected by a limited comparison.

V. The voice of those who remained

The complete chosen Luke passage does not stop at the joy of reunion. In 15:25–32, the elder son hears what is happening, objects and receives his father's response. We cannot add that he enters and agrees completely: the passage supplies no such ending. His presence retains another side of return—the position of someone who never left. His objection need not become a model of conduct, nor need the participants' grounds be made identical. The meeting is simply not exhausted by two voices. This particular religious exchange is more than a contemporary allocation problem, but it helps keep a third participant visible in a literary scene.

In a shared undertaking, those who remained may have done extra work, changed arrangements and made decisions without the former participant. Return needs to notice that history as well as personal absence. Imagine a group preparing an exhibition and inviting a former member to its next stage. The invitation is welcome, but the person does not know who made new materials or which promises already exist. Hearing what happened matters before occupying the old place. This is no compulsory gratitude ceremony or demand to answer for every difficulty others experienced. Their work and decisions simply do not disappear because someone is present again. Their participation has grounds independent of that person’s biographical account.

The voice of those who remained does not give them unlimited authority over the returning person. They can describe a burden and discuss future distribution; absence alone cannot make someone permanently indebted for any assignment. An actual agreement needs particular examination, while general resentment does not automatically confer authority. A literary scene raises a question without deciding a present dispute for its participants. The object must be named: what was previously promised, what others actually completed, and what new participation is proposed? Distinguishing memory of absence from a new agreement makes everyone’s work audible without turning the meeting into an endless trial of someone’s right to be present again.

VI. Meeting again can include new knowledge

In the chosen passages of Persuasion XXIII, Anne and Wentworth renew their relationship through more definite knowledge, conversation and reconsideration of earlier explanations. The years of separation are not simply erased. A character’s account of lost years must not become a verified calculation of what would necessarily have happened after another decision. This is a fictional conversation about the past, not an experiment with an alternative biography. New understanding can be distinguished from a possibility that cannot be tested. The novel lets us ask how return changes the reading of an earlier history without making that account the final cause of every event or promising readers an equivalent renewal.

A renewed encounter sometimes reveals that an earlier impression was incomplete. Someone learns an unknown circumstance, hears another side, or notices their own assumption. This need not make the entire earlier judgment false. One part can be revised while another remains. In an imagined conversation, an acquaintance explains an earlier refusal to work together. The listener understands it better without having to regret every subsequent choice. The new account expands accessible knowledge; it cannot restore the opportunity to live those years again. What was actually learned now needs to be separated from assumptions about an unlived life whose complete outcome nobody can produce for examination.

Chapter XXIV retains Lady Russell’s changed judgments while leaving the couple’s future exposed to anxiety: the closing passage still names possible war in connection with Wentworth’s profession. Return therefore does not guarantee the disappearance of later concerns. It can matter as a particular renewal without providing final protection against the unknown. Marriage, property and naval service belong to the novel’s specific conditions; they cannot become a recommendation to reunite with a former partner. The comparison’s narrower value is that new knowledge can permit a new choice. That choice concerns present people and terms, rather than a restored setting whose future must vindicate the beauty of the scene.

VII. An account of oneself without a compulsory circle

A personal history need not follow departure, trial and return to a starting point. The image may genuinely fit one person; another sees several different beginnings, while a third does not yet want one large plot. A narrative form does not determine the value of what was lived. Absence should particularly not be assigned as a necessary ordeal supposedly required for maturity. New knowledge can be acknowledged without claiming that its entire price was necessary or fair. These editorial distinctions are no universal law extracted from the works. They preserve a reader’s freedom to converse with a literary image without being obliged to reproduce its biographical structure.

An interval can be described only in relation to return, making everything between look like a delay before real life. Yet during that time someone acted, encountered others, made decisions and held obligations. Choosing an earlier activity again does not make the interval empty. Imagine a reader returning to a language once studied and noticing that years spent on other matters also belong to her history. She need not call them lost to take the language seriously now. The example promises no educational effectiveness. It distinguishes a subject’s renewed importance from devaluing everything that did not lead to it by a direct, predetermined route.

An account can use several precise statements instead of a final conclusion: participation mattered then, later it became unavailable, and now it is possible differently; we agreed on one thing then and are discussing another now. This may sound less dramatic, but it retains what was known at different times. It assigns no intention to the past to deliver today’s decision. A literary author chooses order, connections and a stopping point. In our own lives we narrate while remaining participants in unfinished events. Revision therefore remains possible. A changed account need not abandon oneself; it can stop requiring an earlier version to answer every present question.

VIII. A former promise and renewed participation

Time does not erase every earlier matter. An existing agreement, another person’s property or an unfinished handover may need a particular answer. This does not oblige anyone to restore an entire relationship. A former promise’s actual object can be distinguished from a new proposal. In an imagined group, someone returns materials they used and discusses future participation separately. The handover cannot purchase an invitation, and an invitation cannot cancel the handover. Where terms are unclear or require competent clarification, the article does not determine them for participants. Performing a specific earlier action and accepting a new arrangement remain different decisions, even within one meeting.

New terms should be visible to both sides. If a former participant helps with work again, available scope, timing and communication can be named instead of relying only on a familiar feeling of togetherness. Changed possibilities need not abandon loyalty to the undertaking. Loyalty may take the form of an accurate limited promise rather than a large unverified one. It cannot be assigned externally by calling every new burden an old debt. This is ordinary coordination, not a universal conflict procedure. Clear conditions make participation a present decision and prevent “return” from concealing changes to which nobody has yet agreed.

Another clarification may be needed after the meeting. The proposed scope may prove unavailable, someone may have understood the conversation differently, or a new task may appear. This does not automatically establish that return was mistaken or insincere. The change needs timely communication without treating an earlier impression as completed performance. Nor does every altered feeling silently cancel a specific accepted promise. Freedom to revise and responsibility for what was said coexist. This is normative reflection on clear participation, rather than a claim about inevitable behaviour after separation. Literary scenes supply questions about a connection’s form; subsequent terms are established in the situation itself.

IX. The right not to return

The power of return can make another choice look unfinished or disloyal. A real person need not re-enter a former circle because a literary scene ended in reunion. Danger, unwanted contact, changed conditions or a lack of agreement have their own significance. This article does not propose overcoming them for symbolic closure. A place can be remembered without visiting it; an activity respected without resuming it; a person’s significance acknowledged without restoring a relationship. These distinctions decide no situation in advance. They remove the false requirement that a worthy biography must complete a circle and display the old home in its final scene.

Refusal can coexist with sadness without contradiction. Someone may mourn a lost possibility while declining its current form. Sadness is no proof of hidden agreement. Nor should every refusal be labelled purely protective or fully explained from one statement. The actual decision and its available ground deserve attention, with the rest left unknown. A reader need not use a difficult personal experience for an exercise or disclose it to others. This is no clinical explanation, treatment or judgment of an emotion’s correctness. It distinguishes the significance of a feeling from observers’ supposed authority to prescribe a particular return on that basis.

The receiving person also has a right not to resume. Their life may have changed without preserving a vacant former place indefinitely. This can be communicated without humiliation or devaluing the past. Imagine a reading circle whose former arrangement no longer exists: its members may meet separately or may not meet. Nobody must rebuild an organisation to give one account a familiar shape. Actual remaining obligations, if any, are examined separately. The absence of new participation does not declare the past nonexistent. A connection can be acknowledged as once important without assigning it a continuation unsupported by any present agreement.

X. Continuation rather than restoring a setting

After recognition, the Odyssey retains further labour and exchanged accounts; Austen’s renewed intimacy contains fuller knowledge and an unknown future; Luke’s return includes the father’s response and the elder son’s voice. These differences constitute no single theory. They make return readable as an event with several sides rather than a button cancelling time. A reader need reproduce neither an epic test, a religious welcome nor a novel’s wedding. For an ordinary undertaking, the questions can be smaller: what is available again, what needs renewed agreement, and which former ground still matters? An answer concerns the present situation without becoming a final explanation of the whole person.

Continuation may resemble the earlier form or differ visibly. Someone reads the same pages with another question, joins familiar work in a different role, or meets old acquaintances without promising the former frequency of contact. These changes require no compulsory transformation narrative. The actual form of connection can simply be identified. An unsuccessful attempt also deserves an accurate account: the meeting did not lead to participation, the activity remains unavailable, or agreement was not reached. This does not make the event meaningless or require an immediate search for another happy plot. It retains what happened and the boundary beyond which lies the unknown or another person’s present decision.

A story of return can matter deeply without cancelling the difference between past and present. Familiar things retain memories, signs, words and objects; the present contains new

terms, responses and possibilities for clarification. A connection can be named without guaranteeing complete restoration. It may lead to shared continuation, separate gratitude or a clear refusal. Literature certifies no option as obligatory for its reader. It offers scenes in which the grounds of recognition and participation can be examined more closely. Our own biography may continue without requiring every new page to prove that we have finally reached the place where the entire story was supposed to end.

What this means in practice

Choose an ordinary object you recently returned to, or are considering returning to: a book, activity or shared undertaking. Avoid a distressing personal experience, dangerous contact or any requirement to disclose circumstances. Identify what return means here: being present, rereading, participating again, or fulfilling a former agreement. One sentence need not combine all these tasks.

Record what actually remains and what is known about current conditions. Keep the unknown separate. Where others participate, identify a question you cannot answer for them: agreement to meet, available scope or a form of contact. A remembered agreement is not proof of a new one. If a particular obligation remains, distinguish its object from possible renewed participation.

Finally, name one permitted next step: rereading a passage, asking about current terms, proposing a limited meeting, or not continuing yet. Add what this step does not promise to restore. A connection with the past can remain without reviving an earlier arrangement. The record is no treatment or guarantee of clarity; it supports a particular act of reflection. In discussing it, leave another person free to describe return differently or to choose no such image for their own history.

Key quotation

> *more fixed in a knowledge of each other's character…*

— Jane Austen, Persuasion XXIII, paragraph beginning “There they exchanged again”. Original English; ellipsis marks omitted continuation.

Connections between traditions

1. **What grounds recognition?** In Odyssey XXIII, Penelope's hesitation and the marriage-bed account, Butler web lines 1924–1945, distinguish appearance from recognition. Austen's XXIII reunion paragraphs, 1711–1718, connect meeting with fuller knowledge of character. Their shared link is information meaningful to a relationship rather than mere familiarity. The thematic question is what actually permits us to call a connection renewed. The boundary remains: epic signs of a husband's identity and a novel's reconsideration of character answer different questions. Neither supplies a procedure for testing an actual partner.

2. **Return and the receiver's response.** Luke 15:17–24 separates the son's decision to arrive from the father's response. Odyssey XXIII, 1924–1945, gives the returning Odysseus and recognising Penelope different knowledge and actions. The comparison retains the event's second side: appearance does not exhaust recognition or welcome. This checks a one-sided biographical script. Grounds differ: religious mercy in the parable is not an epic test through signs. Safe contact and renewed agreement are editorial conditions, rather than an identical doctrine supposedly found in both works.

3. **Who remains beyond the central reunion?** Luke 15:25–32 includes the elder son's objection without narrating his final entry. In Austen's XXIV, 1761–1765, Lady Russell must reconsider earlier judgments of the couple. Both retain another participant whose position does not disappear with the central renewal. A return therefore need not become the complete shared history of two people. The parable's moral address and a novel's revised social judgment differ; objection is not given universal authority here, and a third person's agreement is not assumed automatically.

4. **Does return remove further uncertainty?** Odyssey XXIII, 1947–1956, leaves further labour, a prophetic horizon and exchanged accounts. Persuasion XXIV, 1779–1780, retains possible-war anxiety after renewed intimacy. Both arrange a meaningful encounter beside an open future. Return is therefore no final protection against every further concern in this article. Epic prophecy and a novel's occupational risk do not become one forecast, and readers' unknown futures cannot be deduced from characters' fates.

5. **Reconsidering the past and taking a present step.** Austen's XXIII, 1745–1753, discusses an earlier decision through differing judgments and an unrealised possibility. Luke 15:17–21 connects a present decision to return with the younger son's changed circumstances. Both raise the question of new understanding accompanying available action without cancelling earlier events. The biographical distinction is between a revised account and restored time. Religious acknowledgment of sin is not reduced to a novel's explanation of separation; an alternative life is unverified, and neither work promises readers renewed relationships.

Primary sources

1. **Homer, Odyssey XXIII.** Samuel Butler's English prose, Project Gutenberg. The complete selected sequence, web lines 1924–1956, was read: hesitation, signs, the bed, recognition, further labour and exchanged accounts. The opening of XXIII and adjacent end of XXII were read as context. This carrier's preface states first publication of the translation in 1900; Butler's hypotheses about epic authorship are not adopted. No whole epic, complete XXIII or Greek-original reading is claimed. Violence and household hierarchy are not proposed as modern norms.

2. **Gospel according to Luke, 15:11–32.** King James Version, Bible Gateway. All twenty-two chosen verses, including the elder son and father's response, and the version label were read. The epigraph is part of 15:24. Religious meaning is not replaced by a compulsory family procedure; the elder son's final entry is not added to the text. No whole-book or Greek-original reading was undertaken.

3. **Jane Austen, Persuasion XXIII–XXIV.** Original English, Project Gutenberg. Complete selected XXIII paragraph sequences, web lines 1710–1720 and 1744–1753, and all XXIV, 1755–1780, were read. Adopted material concerns the couple's fuller knowledge, Lady Russell's reconsideration and remaining future anxiety. The quotation is a fragment of paragraph 1712; ellipsis marks continuation. The carrier labels the work 1818; no complete-novel or manuscript-history study is claimed.

Russian quotations are United Wisdom's own translations: scripture from King James Version, Austen from original English. Comparisons and contemporary scenes are original editorial reasoning. The works are not efficacy studies of the practice, and prescribe no compulsory return to readers.

Tags

return, recognition, biography, literature, Odyssey, Homer, Penelope, Odysseus, Gospel, Luke, parable, elder son, Jane Austen, Persuasion, memory, past, present, time, participation, agreement, boundaries, promise, new knowledge, connection, continuation, separation, encounter, independent judgment, right to refuse, meaning

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.