

UNITED WISDOM

The letter of a rule and its purpose

Relationships and Intimacy

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

R-26-N02 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

The letter of a rule and its purpose

Epigraph

> *the letter or the intention*

Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria*, VII.6.12; a short fragment in a historical discussion of interpreting a written rule. It does not provide contemporary permission to break the law.

What this article is about

A small voluntary reading room displays a notice: when leaving the room, place books on the return table. Vera steps out for fifteen minutes, leaving an open volume at her desk. Elena, the volunteer on duty, moves it to the return table. When Vera returns, she says the rule exists to ensure books are shelved correctly, and she intended to continue reading. Elena replies that the visitor left the room, so the condition applied. Both know the same words but give them different scopes. This is an imagined editorial scene, not an observed case, an account of an actual library or evidence of how visitors and staff usually behave.

The article considers the relationship between a shared condition's wording and its established purpose. Choosing the kinder person does not resolve the question: literal readings can have grounds, and assumed purposes can be invented. We need to distinguish known text, evidence of intention, application to a case and a new proposal. Our subject is interpreting an announced condition of shared voluntary work. The article establishes neither legal rights nor guaranteed correct decisions or agreement. It grants readers no authority to change others' arrangements at will, even when a proposed purpose appears reasonable.

I. Preserve the actual words first

Vera remembers that books must not be returned to shelves by visitors themselves. Elena reads a different notice about leaving the room. The conditions may be related without being the same sentence. If Vera argues with her memory and Elena with the wall notice, they begin with different subjects. First, they can establish the available current record, its location and known version. An exhaustive history of library rules is unnecessary. The particular condition should not be replaced by a convenient version that is easier to defend or reject. An unknown notice date must also remain unknown until there are grounds to establish it.

A literal reading does not mean refusing to think. Words limit expected actions and help people prepare without guessing someone else's mood. A visitor can expect that a familiar volunteer's friend will not receive an unannounced exception after the visitor leaves. Elena can expect a

particular scope of work. These are reasons to value the record, rather than proof that every text is perfect. Contradictory words or an undefined short break still present a difficulty. Respecting the record lets us describe its deficiency precisely rather than accuse every literal reader of lacking humanity or wanting to control visitors.

We can identify the particular word carrying the dispute. Here, leaving may mean ending a visit or any absence beyond the door. Both may understand books, room and return table. A complete revision of reading-room rules is therefore not yet necessary. Keeping the subject narrow prevents a question about fifteen minutes from becoming a dispute about people's entire freedom to read. Clarification does not guarantee an easy answer. It limits the claim: the current record raises a question about one condition's scope, rather than establishing that every other part of the shared arrangement has become invalid or optional.

Sometimes wording is unambiguous: even during a short absence, every book must go to the return table. Vera's proposal should then be described as a different arrangement, rather than the discovery of a hidden meaning. She can consider change desirable while calling it a change where the known words exclude her option. The opposite is also possible: the notice explicitly permits a marked desk during a short break, but Elena reads its first line only. The complete record matters more than a convenient fragment. Both possibilities concern verifiable content, rather than the presumed character of whoever currently disagrees with us.

II. Establish purpose rather than infer it from convenience

Vera thinks the purpose is correct shelving. Perhaps an organiser's explanation establishes this. Perhaps she inferred it herself because the condition otherwise seems inconvenient. These grounds differ. She can identify a document, an earlier notice, a relevant account by a responsible person or her own conjecture. Conjecture is permissible without being an established intention. Where evidence is absent, the question remains open. A reasonable proposed purpose can inform an amendment, but does not establish that the present rule was created precisely for that purpose or lacked another significant function.

A notice can serve several purposes. Books may be gathered for tracking, freeing desks and checking completeness before closing. Vera sees shelving because it is visible. Elena may know about another visitor awaiting a desk. Her role, however, does not establish complete knowledge of every reason either. Available explanations differ from expansive assurances that every detail was planned without gaps. Some conditions develop gradually and persist through habit. That history does not automatically make them pointless; it prevents us from treating a comprehensive intention as known when nobody has established it.

The present application also has an aim. Elena wants to finish her shift on time. This is a real circumstance without becoming the record's historical purpose merely because it now affects

action. Vera wants to preserve the open page. Her wish is understandable without establishing the shared notice's meaning. If original intention, current needs and a preferred decision's convenience are mixed together, either side can find a suitable purpose. All three can be examined separately. People need not conceal personal interests, but cannot present those interests as grounds already accepted by everyone else in the reading room.

An established purpose does not necessarily justify every present detail. An organiser could intend to free desks yet formulate a condition too broadly. Narrow wording could fail to provide necessary tracking. These are possible mismatches, rather than an established defect in our scene. We cannot preselect wording as the error and purpose as the correct answer. Sometimes the words protect someone from shifting explanations; sometimes a new explanation exposes a real gap. Interpretation should allow both outcomes and retain known grounds even when they prevent quick, pleasant agreement about where Vera's book belongs.

III. An ancient dispute does not grant contemporary permission

In Book VII, Chapter 6 of *Institutio Oratoria*, Quintilian discusses disagreements between a written enactment's words and its author's intention. This is instruction in argument, using historical legal examples. He shows that disputants can seek grounds in different parts of a condition. We actually read the selected continuous context VII.5.2–7.4 in H. E. Butler's English translation, including all of VII.6.1–12. This is neither the whole treatise nor contemporary national law. Ancient teaching cases do not determine the volunteer's authority, visitors' access or how a new notice is adopted in today's imagined reading room.

For our subject, an appeal to intention matters as something requiring justification. It does not remove the need to consider words and the consequences of interpretation. Yet the article does not transfer every technique of courtroom eloquence into ordinary shared work. Elena and Vera need not construct accusations, defeat an opponent or reproduce ancient situations. Our comparison is narrower: wording and assumed intention may supply different arguments, and a confident assertion alone cannot establish their connection. Historical descriptions of possible disputes also do not prove that every such dispute will be helpful, safe or improve shared arrangements.

The article's short quotations belong to Quintilian's own argument in the selected English translation. They do not turn a contemporary amendment into his recommendation. We do not claim that he would endorse Vera's absence, Elena's transfer or the principle of a voluntary reading room. Such conclusions would need different grounds and still remain historical interpretations. An old question can retain its precise name without assigning our answer to its author. Readers also need this limit: similar words do not establish identical institutions, participant roles or decision costs across an ancient orator's school and a present small shared space.

The source also helps us avoid treating literal grounds as inherently poorer than reasoning about purpose. Both matter within the dispute. A simple balance between them, however, does not determine a contemporary case: its current notice and available authority must be established. Where that information is absent, the article leaves the answer unknown. Every question need not end with a wise formula apparently reconciling everything. Our historical basis is limited to the selected argument. The contemporary scene is editorial, and we make further proposals in our own names, preserving the difference between a read passage and an imagined continuation of its idea.

IV. A useful outcome does not establish a correct reading

Vera left the book open and genuinely returned. This establishes her return, rather than the rule's permission to keep a desk occupied. An outcome convenient for her, without visible loss, can obscure someone else's possible wait. We should not invent damage either. Our scene leaves unknown whether another reader was waiting or wanted the book. Both limits remain: a successful private outcome does not establish general permission, and a possible inconvenience does not become an actual event merely because it helps defend a literal condition.

Elena moved the book, making her return list tidier. This is the outcome of a particular operation. It does not establish that Vera ended her visit or that the notice's entire purpose was a tidy list. Accurate tracking and reading access may need to coexist. Sometimes available resources cannot preserve both conveniences. The question of arrangements then remains even after a precisely performed action. Elena's real work can be acknowledged without making every outcome the final solution to a rule's meaning. A lost page can likewise be identified without portraying the transfer as deliberate punishment or evidence of opposition to reading altogether.

Checking a purpose requires the appropriate scale. If its aim is freeing desks after work ends, we need to establish precisely that ending and the desk's availability. If its aim is tracking all books at every departure, departure itself matters. These are different questions even when the visible movement of a volume is identical. We should not choose our measure retrospectively to suit a desired outcome. Stated grounds come first, then a relevant fact. Even that sequence does not guarantee correctness: grounds can be incomplete, data missing or meanings disputed. It makes visible why someone connects an event to a condition, instead of relying on a general feeling that things went well.

Sometimes only a small outcome can be acknowledged: a visitor returned, a book was found, a desk became free or an explanation arrived. None must be called justice restored throughout the reading room. An assumed purpose may have been achieved accidentally today. A literal operation may have been performed without its needed result. Another case requires fresh

consideration of known conditions. One example can identify a question without replacing the history of application. Readers receive no ready-made rule-effectiveness test from this scene, but a distinction between an actual action, an established meaning and an assumed advantage requiring separate examination.

V. Interpretation and amendment have different scopes

Clarifying what a notice calls leaving differs from authorising a new kind of break. The first can rely on an available explanation; the second creates a condition absent before. If Elena describes every change as merely recovering meaning, visitors struggle to understand what they could expect yesterday. If Vera calls every clarification a new prohibition, she broadens the subject too. We need to identify what the current arrangement contains and what someone proposes adding. This distinction does not prohibit change. It gives change the accurate name needed to understand its cost, performer and starting time.

The volunteer may have authority to apply a record without rewriting it. An organiser may change the notice without knowing every shift's work. Confidence, age and skill at explaining purpose do not establish these roles. Known agreements matter, rather than self-appointed authority to decide for everyone. Where authority is unknown, a responsible person can be asked when available and when contact is appropriate. Vera need not negotiate at any cost. Participation can sometimes be postponed, or a proposal left undecided, while preserving the difference between a submitted request and an amended shared rule.

A new condition can require labour. Permitted breaks may require a desk marker, time limit and method of checking whether a visitor returned. Someone must read the marker and refrain from taking the desk. Without accepted responsibility for that work, an attractive explanation of purpose has not created a functioning arrangement. This is part of an amendment's content, rather than an argument against every amendment. It belongs alongside the desired convenience. Vera should not promise others' monitoring, nor Elena future visitors' agreement. A proposal can be limited to one known situation, or acknowledged as unworkable with present means.

A rule can remain after consideration. The organiser might explain that any absence frees the desk for another visitor, with no separate storage for open books. Vera can dislike the condition while understanding its subject. Another reading room, working method or the present arrangement may be chosen where participation remains voluntary. The article demands neither satisfaction with every explanation nor guaranteed alternatives. It does not prescribe amendment as the necessary outcome of reasonable thought. Clarification sometimes ends in a particular disagreement that cannot honestly be described as an already achieved shared decision.

VI. New explanations affect earlier expectations

Another visitor, Anton, always returned books during even short absences. He lost his place while following the notice. Elena now explains that only independent shelving matters. Anton can ask why he previously performed unnecessary work. Saying the true meaning was always obvious does not resolve that question. Perhaps another arrangement genuinely applied earlier; perhaps explanations were not available to everyone; perhaps he overlooked a known line. Without established grounds, the article assigns no blame. It preserves earlier expectations and the need to distinguish new clarity from incorrectly portraying the past as already clear to everybody.

Not every change needs a large inquiry. A small voluntary reading room may need a clear date and notice to those currently affected. Notification scope should nevertheless match the actual change. One amended word can alter desk access; a long new explanation can simply restate an existing condition. Text length does not measure cost. Anton's use of the old notice tomorrow cannot automatically be called stubbornness. First, we need to establish whether a new version was available and what it changed, rather than require him to guess an organiser's current will from successive conversations by the door.

Retrospective explanation also has limits. Elena can acknowledge that an unclear record permitted different readings. This does not make every past action equally justified. Known circumstances need consideration, rather than a general claim of misunderstanding erasing all differences. Vera can acknowledge her own conjecture about purpose while retaining her amendment proposal. Anton can remain dissatisfied. Participants need not supply a happy shared version of events. A more accurate outcome establishes which condition applied, what remains disputed and what arrangement is now proposed, where the relevant decision has actually been made.

History matters to the next volunteer too. They missed the conversation and should not have to guess whether a marked break is a current condition or a private concession. A brief explanation can be left in the accepted place with a known scope and date. This editorial proposal does not require an elaborate record system. The next person needs neither every conversational detail nor personal information automatically inserted into a public notice. A relevant record of the rule itself is needed. A saved explanation still does not establish that it was read, understood correctly or applied in the next similar case.

VII. Exceptions should not disguise themselves as others' intentions

Elena knows Vera and is confident she will return soon. She may want to leave the volume for Vera specifically. That is personal trust, rather than an established purpose of the notice. If volunteers may make such decisions, the limits need to be known. Otherwise personal confidence cannot become the new meaning of shared words without acknowledging change. A friendly response should not be portrayed as every organiser's established intention. An unfamiliar visitor can be equally conscientious. The article does not demand identical assessments of every circumstance; it asks us not to hide the actual reason for differing responses behind a universal story about purpose.

Known unusual circumstances can justify an exception. An exception's existence, however, does not establish future general permission. Its particular case, decision-maker and duration need to be understood where the decision is possible. Vera should not promise another visitor the same concession on an absent Elena's behalf. Elena should not treat Vera's agreement as authority to change the next volunteer's work. A good individual experience still leaves questions about later application. It can justify proposing a new record without replacing an adopted decision or proving that everybody already has the same available way to step out briefly.

The reverse substitution is possible: a strict response is declared the only way to honour purpose although the established aim allows several methods. Book tracking may sometimes be possible through an accepted marker; sometimes that method is unavailable. Actual conditions require examination in either case. Less strict actions cannot all be labelled laziness, nor every literal operation virtue. A rule describes a particular arrangement; human dignity is not measured by the number of books moved. The subject remains concrete: which methods are accepted and workable for the stated purpose, and which exist only in the desire for an orderly explanation without necessary work?

Pressure or threats can make conversation unsuitable. The article does not require testing another's intention through direct confrontation, establish the space's safety or replace appropriate support. Voluntariness is an explicit editorial condition in our scene; readers' lives may lack it. That changes available actions although the distinction between text and purpose remains meaningful. A question can be considered privately, participation limited or action postponed. Optional action does not make every conclusion correct. It preserves room to think without the extra demand to announce a chosen interpretation to someone controlling one's present circumstances.

VIII. An open question can be more accurate than a convenient purpose

The conversation might reveal that nobody knows the notice's origin. This is a bounded research result, rather than evidence that it lacks a purpose. The available current record can be established and future arrangements discussed while past intention remains unknown. Attractive stories of care or discipline need not fill the gap. A new condition can be justified by current tasks and honestly called new. This answer may seem less complete, but it assigns no unsupported intention to people in the past and does not require visitors to accept invented history before discussing today's desk.

Another possibility is finding an earlier explanation permitting marked desks during short absences, with that line later disappearing. This supports considering known history without automatically restoring an old rule. An intervening decision may have reflected new, currently unknown conditions. Elena can clarify the present version; Vera can propose restoring the earlier one. Historical origin differs from current validity. The article does not require loading every past document. It preserves the particular evidence's limit: one discovered line establishes its content and time, where known, without explaining every later change in the reading room.

Returning to the open volume allows several outcomes. Vera finds her page and accepts present arrangements. Elena gains authority to clarify the notice. The organiser retains the condition. Or the question remains unresolved because the responsible person is absent. These states should not all be called agreement. Finding a book is not creating a rule; a new record is not proven success in application. Participants may continue with a particular disagreement where conditions allow, or stop participating. None of these outcomes determines the character of whoever approached wording through purpose or preferred the actual words.

Letter and purpose become clearer when their grounds and limits are known. Words preserve expectations; purpose helps examine the link between a condition and a task. Each argument, however, needs its own support. Interpretation should not conceal amendment, amendment its costs, nor favourable outcomes the absence of general permission. Readers retain choices: accept a known condition, clarify a disputed word, propose another record or decline participation where possible. Vera's volume does not choose for them. Further consideration begins with available text and relevant evidence, rather than a preselected victory for either letter or intention.

What this means in practice

If you wish, choose one small condition of available voluntary work. Preserve its actual wording and known version. Identify the disputed part, then separately note established purpose, personal conjecture and present needs. A convenient answer does not require invented history. This editorial exercise is neither a legal dispute-resolution method, scientifically validated technique nor assessment of personal conscientiousness. A private note can remain a sufficient result even without contacting anybody or proposing amendments.

Where clarification is appropriate, distinguish requests to explain present conditions from proposals for new ones. Check the recipient's known authority, necessary work and affected expectations. Do not promise someone else's concession to future participants. Where purpose is unknown, retain that limit. Direct conversation is not prescribed under threats; a step can be postponed or declined. The exercise does not guarantee agreement, safety or correct decisions, nor convert an amendment's presumed usefulness into adopted permission to act differently.

Later, name the actual outcome: text found, explanation received, amendment proposed, a new condition adopted or a particular action performed. These events differ. Check the relevant result only, without requiring a happy shared history. One convenient application does not establish the entire arrangement. One unclear notice does not prove all rules pointless. Further decisions remain open and depend on actual conditions our imagined reading room does not determine for readers beforehand.

Key quotation

> *gain support from the intention*

Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria*, VII.6.9; a short fragment from H. E. Butler's English translation. A historical interpretive argument, rather than an independent contemporary right to depart from a condition.

Connections between traditions

Basis	Comparison question	Limit
Quintilian, VII.6	How is the relation of wording and intention justified?	Ancient argument instruction, not contemporary legal permission
Imagined reading room	Which word is disputed, and what purpose is known?	Our editorial scene, not library research
Interpretation and amendment	What does a condition contain, and what is proposed as an addition?	Authority and execution need separate establishment

Sources

1. Quintilian. *Institutio Oratoria*, Book VII, exact web version, H. E. Butler's English translation, Loeb Classical Library, 1920. The selected continuous context VII.5.2–7.4, web22–47, including all of VII.6.1–12, was actually read. Not the entire treatise or Latin original. The host identifies this publication as public domain in the US; worldwide status UNKNOWN. Short attributed fragments and bounded paraphrase only, without full-source import. Historical legal and teaching examples establish neither present rights, duties to violate conditions nor effectiveness of contemporary amendments.

Tags

rule, letter, purpose, intention, text, interpretation, grounds, evidence, version, history, clarification, amendment, authority, voluntary participation, expectation, decision costs, exception, trust, application, outcome, uncertainty, agreement, limit, reading room, book, workspace, Quintilian, rhetoric, shared work, independence, 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 the 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.