


UNITED WISDOM

# Silence in Messages and the Meaning We Assign to It

Relationships and Intimacy

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

R-30-N01 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

# Silence in Messages and the Meaning We Assign to It

## Epigraph

> *“You see what?”*

May Bartram, a character in Henry James’s *The Beast in the Jungle* (1903), Chapter IV. A brief reply asking what her companion considers understood. This is fictional dialogue, not the author’s psychological rule. Primary text.

## What this article is about

A message goes out in the morning. It proposes meeting on Saturday and asks about buying tickets. By evening, no reply has arrived. The sender first thinks the person is busy, then that the meeting means nothing to them, and finally writes a long explanation of why she must not be ignored. In a few hours, one observable fact has acquired a whole story about the relationship. Yet there is still no answer, and the story belongs to the person waiting.

A pause in messages can affect plans and feelings. That consequence can be named without establishing someone else’s motive. It helps to distinguish a missing message, an agreed response time, and an interpretation of silence. Through Polina and Roman’s hypothetical exchange, we will consider a limited clarification, choices about our own time, the other person’s right to keep reasons private, and how to avoid making a message a test of love. Clarity remains possible even if we never learn the full story behind another person’s pause.

## I. A missing reply and its explanation

Polina invites Roman to an exhibition on Saturday. Tickets need to be bought, so she asks whether the time suits him. There is no answer that evening. We know what the question said and that no answer has appeared in this exchange. We do not yet know whether Roman saw the message, could consider the proposal, or wants to attend. Even Polina’s confidence about their usual communication does not explain today’s particular pause.

The distinction is straightforward: Roman has not replied; Polina thinks he does not want to meet. The second statement may be true, but it needs grounds beyond the first. Calling an inference an observation removes room for revision: a later answer becomes a defence against an accusation already settled. The person must then do more than explain Saturday;

they must prove another person’s account of their intention wrong and establish their right to tell a different story.

A list of possible causes establishes none of them. Roman could be busy, forgetful, uncertain, or unwilling to discuss it. These possibilities reveal uncertainty without replacing an answer. The kindest or most worrying explanation need not become fact. The inference can remain limited: participation is unconfirmed, so it cannot yet support buying a second ticket or making promises to other people.

Polina’s expectation is a separate fact. She expected an answer today because they usually arrange meetings quickly. This experience may explain her surprise. It does not turn their habitual pace into an explicitly accepted commitment. Establishing a broken agreement requires knowing whether a deadline existed for this question. An unspoken expectation matters when discussing future communication, but it should not quietly become a promise the other person supposedly already made.

Sometimes the cause becomes known later. It can change the episode’s interpretation without cancelling its practical consequences: tickets sold out, the evening remained free, or the meeting never happened. Explaining a cause and repairing a result are different questions. Polina can accept Roman’s account while discussing how to handle another invitation with a deadline. She need not choose between complete blame and pretending that the missing reply changed nothing.

If the explanation never arrives, that is also a legitimate limit to knowledge. Polina can decide which plans remain possible without confirmation. She need not wait indefinitely to prove trust. But it helps to state the basis of her decision: the meeting is unagreed, so she is arranging Saturday differently. This does not decide the relationship’s future or turn an unknown intention into an established rejection of the person.

## II. A message contains several questions

Polina’s first message combines an invitation, a time, and a question about tickets. Roman may want to meet while not knowing his schedule. He may know the time but not want the exhibition. He may be able to answer the practical question without discussing the relationship. Waiting for one comprehensive yes merges these uncertainties, making the absence of that answer look like rejection of everything at once.

It helps to identify the answer needed for an action. Buying the second ticket requires confirmation of participation. Choosing Polina’s own evening requires only recognising that there is no confirmation yet. Discussing a sense of distance would need another conversation, with a different purpose and an option to decline. A practical question does not automatically

authorise that wider discussion. They can be offered separately while retaining the distinction between a plan and an experience.

Clarification should not become a series of new tasks. If ten messages follow the invitation, asking about work, feelings, and other people, answering the original question becomes harder. Roman must now untangle Saturday and someone else's story about him. In a small, safe situation, one limited follow-up may be enough if appropriate: participation needs confirmation by a particular time, while reasons may remain private.

Not every question warrants pursuit. If someone has already asked not to be contacted or declined a topic, a pause does not authorise bypassing that boundary through another channel. We can preserve our own decision without further contact. Where communication was never mutually accepted, a missing reply creates no duty to begin a conversation. This article concerns ordinary mutual messaging; it offers no method for gaining access to someone who has not granted it.

Sometimes narrowing the subject brings clarity. Polina can explain that only the ticket purchase is being decided now, while their usual pace of communication could be discussed later if both want. This does not prohibit feelings. It prevents substitution: a practical answer does not become an obligatory affirmation of intimacy, and a conversation about intimacy should not hide inside an urgent question about two exhibition places.

The other person may also request clarification. Roman asks whether the invitation requires paying for a ticket immediately. This neither confirms nor rejects participation. It identifies a missing part of the decision. If Polina automatically reads it as evasion, agreement becomes less possible. Answering the question and leaving the remainder unknown is more useful than demanding proof of the clarification's sincerity first.

## III. Sent does not mean agreed

Polina sees that the message was sent. Even an interface indicator cannot establish understanding, an opportunity to reply, or consent. A technical sign and a human decision belong to different levels. We are not describing a particular platform's operation, which can vary. The inference's limit remains: a transmission status does not replace a substantive answer to a proposal.

Someone may see the first line without the whole question or notice the invitation while understanding the date differently. These possibilities do not show what happened to Roman. They explain why an external sign cannot establish the entire process of reading. For a shared action, confirmed meaning matters more: does he agree to Saturday, at what time, and what will he actually do next?

Silence can have an agreed meaning in a narrow situation. The parties might have arranged that Roman would report only changes to an already confirmed plan before Friday. Then the lack of another message belongs to a known arrangement rather than Polina’s guess. But an earlier confirmation differs from a new invitation. A rule for one occasion cannot apply to every future request merely because it was once convenient.

Even a known agreement needs attention when conditions change. The meeting moves to another place or costs more. This may constitute a new proposal. A lack of objections need not authorise extra expense, publicity, or other people’s participation. Where a change matters to someone, a separate answer is preferable. An organiser’s convenience does not make previous consent universal authority over every variation.

Memories of an agreement may differ. Polina thinks an answer was promised that evening; Roman remembers only a request to check his schedule. They can return to the wording and establish what is known. If no precise record exists, uncertainty can remain. Confidence in the account need not determine who is right. The next arrangement can become clearer without a final verdict on who misunderstood the previous one.

Checking meaning should not become checking a device. Screen captures, browsing records, or a minute-by-minute account are unnecessary to prove respect for a message. Such information is not the ordinary price of a practical answer. Polina may say that buying tickets without confirmation does not work for her. That is enough for her own choice; it does not authorise investigating Roman’s private digital life.

## IV. A deadline helps decide one’s own part

Tickets are available until Thursday. Polina can state this limit and explain that she will make another plan afterwards. The deadline concerns an action she is organising. It need not threaten the relationship. The difference lies in the outcome: she stops waiting for ticket confirmation or uses the time to force the other person to demonstrate the meeting’s importance. The same hours can serve different purposes.

A clear deadline does not create consent if no answer comes. It makes the sender’s next action known. Polina does not buy a ticket for Roman or declare him a participant. Perhaps she goes alone; perhaps she drops the exhibition. These are her choices. They need no claim that Roman deliberately prevented the meeting, and no promise that clarity will necessarily improve the relationship.

A deadline needs to fit its subject. Choosing an evening does not require explaining an entire pause immediately. If an invitation arrives an hour before purchase, every slow answer should not become disloyalty. The arrangement may simply allow too little time. This can be

acknowledged without self-abasement: the proposal was late, confirmation is absent, so the other person will not be included in the expense.

If an answer arrives after the deadline, the new plan need not disappear. Polina can say that she has arranged something else. This is not necessarily punishment. Roman may be disappointed, but his late acceptance does not automatically cancel another person’s actions. Another meeting can be considered if both want. A reply, changing one’s own plan, and wanting continued contact remain three distinct decisions.

In some situations, the parties did accept an obligation to respond. Both might have confirmed a joint purchase and agreed to clarify the time that evening. The missing reply then concerns a specific promise. Discussion may address its fulfilment and consequences. Even here, a missed deadline does not prove a hidden motive or general incapacity for intimacy. Responsibility for an agreement is serious enough without an invented diagnosis.

Sometimes no shared response-time arrangement exists. Polina can state her limit and suggest discussing a future approach. Roman may decline a permanent speed of reply. This raises a question of compatible conditions rather than a task to fix one person. Their form of communication may need to change. Until discussion, that remains uncertain; one pause does not establish it.

## V. Another person’s correction matters more than an attractive guess

In Chapter IV of *The Beast in the Jungle*, John Marcher assigns a meaning to May Bartram’s response, and she corrects his understanding. This fictional scene allows comparison between an interpreter’s certainty and a companion’s answer. It neither studies messaging nor establishes contemporary people’s motives. The characters’ dialogue.

In our hypothetical story, Roman replies that he did not know when his work would finish. Polina can explain that a message acknowledging uncertainty would have been enough for the ticket question. But if she keeps insisting that he actually intended to express indifference, his correction has no place. The conversation becomes a defence of the sender’s version. Information that could change understanding now serves only as material for suspicion.

Accepting a correction does not mean accepting every evaluation. Roman can explain his reason while Polina describes the missing reply’s consequences. These positions can coexist. He did not intend to hurt her; she had to change the plan. Good intentions do not remove a result, and a result does not establish bad intentions. Clarification allows examination of what is known without requiring one story about whose feelings were correct.

A correction may be incomplete or contradictory. A specific contradiction can be named substantively. But an unknown detail does not establish every theory of deception. For the next ticket decision, a limited answer may suffice: participation is unconfirmed. A conversation about trust has another scale and should not quietly become an interrogation about every detail in the explanation of one pause.

Polina can also correct her first message. She realises she wrote as if the meeting had been decided and clarifies that it was an invitation, not an instruction. This does not require abandoning her desire to meet. It changes the request's form. A mutual opportunity to correct meaning avoids fixed roles where one person always determines what was said and the other answers to an interpretation already complete.

Every clarification need not become a long conversation. Sometimes accepting the newly known fact and ending the practical question is enough. If Polina still wants to discuss the broader pace of communication, she can offer that separately. Roman can agree, choose a time, or decline. The fictional example raises a question about understanding without selecting the proper ending for this hypothetical story.

## VI. The feeling of waiting can be named without blame

Polina notices that waiting occupies her entire evening. This describes her experience without proving that Roman deliberately controlled her attention. She can say uncertainty makes planning difficult or put her phone away for a while. These actions concern her own life. They need no theory of someone else's character and should not become a hidden attempt to provoke a particular response.

A feeling and a request to another person are connected but distinct. Polina is sad that the meeting is unagreed. She can request clearer answers to future invitations. Roman can accept, suggest a different time frame, or say he cannot be continually available. Discussion does not guarantee matching expectations. Its purpose is to make conditions exist somewhere beyond one party's guesses.

There is no need to prescribe one correct messaging speed. One pair of friends may prefer same-day replies; another may prefer an exchange every few days. What matters is a known subject and an actually accepted arrangement. An urgent work task and a personal invitation may need different channels, but we are setting no norm for every situation. Comparison with other relationships cannot confirm one meaning for today's pause.

Self-care can include ending the wait. Polina buys her own ticket and continues her evening. She need not announce this conspicuously to make Roman feel a loss. If the information matters for the shared plan, it can be communicated briefly. The distinction between a

personal limit and punishment concerns what the action does to the question, rather than an attractive label of boundaries that could decorate any behaviour.

A recurring difficulty need not be dismissed. If uncertainty occurs repeatedly, several specific episodes can be considered and an available format discussed. Yet repetition of an external sign alone does not reveal a hidden motive. It gives more information about how the existing arrangement affects plans. Continuing, changing, or ending that format is the participants' decision and needs their circumstances, which the article does not know.

Sometimes discussing the wait is unwanted or unsafe now. A joint exercise is then unnecessary. We can limit our own actions and seek accessible support. The article does not recommend enduring pressure for the sake of calm clarification or maintaining contact at any cost. Respecting a pause's unknown meaning is compatible with noticing a known threat: stopping dangerous contact does not require establishing every intention first.

## VII. Testing a reaction creates another situation

Polina decides not to answer the next message deliberately to see how Roman behaves. This is a new action, rather than passive waiting for the previous reply. Its result will show a reaction to created conditions without automatically revealing the original pause's motive. The test is particularly unclear if the other person does not know that proof is expected. A hidden trial of the relationship replaces clarification.

A similar substitution occurs when a sender writes an alarming sentence to obtain a quick answer. Even if a response arrives, it does not confirm the desired interpretation of the past. Roman may have answered the alarm rather than the exhibition question. Received attention cannot become proof of love or previous indifference without further grounds. The ticket question is better addressed on its subject than through an artificial event designed to measure a feeling.

The article does not propose such tests. We can state the answer needed, a personal limit, or a wish to discuss recurring arrangements. This does not guarantee the other person's sincerity or remove all doubts. It does keep the subject known. A person understands the invitation to respond and can choose without having to decipher an unspoken criterion against which they will later be assessed.

Avoiding a test does not mean abandoning factual checks. The parties can establish whether a deadline was agreed, which plan is confirmed, and what was actually done. This examines a known action. It differs from making someone behave in a particular way to read their inner world. A practical question permits a limited result: a commitment was missed, its reason is unknown, and the next arrangement remains unagreed.

There is also no need to recruit acquaintances to find out why someone is silent. Passing on private correspondence expands participation and may introduce another breach of agreement. If support requires discussing the situation, we can choose a limited account without unnecessary details and consider existing privacy commitments. Support should not quietly become mediation, surveillance, or a pressure campaign to obtain a reply.

If a hidden test has already occurred, the action can be acknowledged and the original question restored. Polina explains that she intentionally delayed her answer but that this did not clarify her request. Roman may decline to continue. Acknowledgment does not purchase immediate trust. It makes previously hidden conditions partly known and allows consequences to be discussed without declaring the response definitive proof of someone’s essence.

## VIII. Uncertainty does not remove available choices

By Thursday, Roman has still not replied about the exhibition. Polina chooses another plan. The story need not end with a revelation that he lost interest, was busy, or wanted punishment. The hypothetical example remains limited. The reliable result is that the shared meeting was unconfirmed and Polina arranged her own Saturday. This required neither treating silence as consent nor establishing the other person’s inner state.

A conversation about the future may follow. It begins with specifics: a suitable deadline for invitations involving purchases, a possible answer under uncertainty, and what each person does without confirmation. Their preferences may differ. That is useful information even without one rule. Mismatched expectations need not immediately become a moral assessment; they may require another arrangement or dropping some shared plans.

A new arrangement needs room for revision. Roman agreed to reply by evening, but his schedule changed. Polina started planning trips earlier. They can update the agreement if both want. A rule helps within a known scope. It does not make every future reply obligatory or remove the right to keep personal reasons private. The minimum needed for action remains separate from a right to someone’s whole story.

If clarity does not emerge, the conversation has not necessarily failed. Polina learned that Roman is not ready to promise a particular response time. Her planning can now account for that known boundary. She may decide whether the format suits her. The article chooses neither continuation nor separation and does not promise that attentive words will lead to closeness. The participants have circumstances absent from the example.

Silence does not become neutral in every respect merely because its motive is unknown. It can cost shared actions and leave another person without needed confirmation. The cost can be named without alleging secret intentions. This preserves two responsibilities: avoid inventing

another person’s inner answer and avoid denying the known effect of a missing external answer on one’s own life.

Messaging becomes clearer through small distinctions. What was sent, confirmed, promised, and added by interpretation? Where did the deadline end, and which action now belongs to me? Keeping these questions separate stops a pause from automatically speaking for someone else. It remains an event we can account for, clarify, or leave unknown, retaining our own choice and the companion’s right not to become a character in our completed story.

## What this means in practice

In an ordinary, safe exchange, you can voluntarily examine one episode of waiting. Record the observable message, any known agreement, and your interpretation separately. If the interpretation starts with what the other person really feels, retain it as a hypothesis. Deciding the immediate task may need only the fact that confirmation is absent.

Identify one necessary answer. Separate a practical question from a conversation about closeness. Where appropriate, one short clarification can give a deadline and explain your subsequent action. A missing reply does not authorise including someone in expense or participation. An already stated refusal of contact remains in force.

After the deadline, choose an action within your own life. It need not be a message designed to provoke jealousy or guilt. If a reply arrives later, the new plan can be stated without a verdict on motive. An accepted obligation is considered separately: what was promised, what happened, and what repair is possible if both wish to discuss it.

Do not test feelings through a manufactured pause, an alarming message, or intermediaries. That creates a new episode without automatically explaining the previous one. Available checks concern the agreement’s words and the action’s result. Another person’s correction needs a chance to change your understanding; the unknown can remain unfilled.

The exercise may be declined or stopped. Under threat, coercion, or unwanted contact, personal safety and accessible support matter more than joint clarification. Sensitive information need not be disclosed, and messaging need not continue at any cost. A small result is a clearer plan, stated refusal, revised deadline, or honestly retained uncertainty; improvement in the relationship is not promised.

## Key quotation

> *“It’s not what you think”.*

May Bartram, a character in Henry James's *The Beast in the Jungle*, Chapter IV. A short fragment correcting Marcher's interpretation. Its meaning belongs to this fictional scene; it does not establish what every silent person conceals. Context.

## Connections between traditions

| Comparison | Shared question and limit |
|---|---|
| James's fictional dialogue ↔ clarifying messages | An interpreter's certainty may differ from a companion's answer. A literary scene is not research on digital communication. |
| Responsible shared planning ↔ private reasons | A necessary minimum enables action. A practical request gives no right to an entire private history. |
| Unknown motive ↔ known consequence | A cause may remain open although a plan changed. Neither cancels the other. |
| Choosing independently ↔ limiting the wait | One can make a personal plan without confirmation. That limit should not become a hidden test of feelings. |
| Addams's historical flexibility ↔ revising a format | A way of interacting can be discussed again. Historical neighbourhood work does not determine an obligatory speed of personal replies. |

## Primary sources and research

1. Henry James. The Beast in the Jungle (1903). Version information, selected passages, and the continuous central conversation in Chapters IV–V were read. This is a transcription of the Martin Secker 1915 edition; the whole novella is not claimed as read. Both fragments are spoken by May Bartram. Literary comparison without psychological or empirical conclusions; global rights status remains undetermined.

2. Jane Addams. Twenty Years at Hull-House (1910), Chapter VI. A selected continuous passage on flexible methods and neighbourhood relationships, the preface, and Macmillan 1912 version information were read. A brief historical comparison is used here without direct quotations. This is neither a theory of messaging nor a universal norm of availability.

## Tags

messaging, silence, missing reply, pause, interpretation, Henry James, May Bartram, John Marcher, The Beast in the Jungle, agreement, deadline, waiting, confirmation, invitation, private reasons, privacy, consent, refusal, clarification, responsibility, personal choice, consequences, uncertainty, messages, shared plan, correction, contact boundaries, Jane Addams, revision, listening, trust, freedom

## 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 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.