

UNITED WISDOM

Reading a religious text: literal, historical and symbolic questions

World and Consciousness

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

W07 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Reading a religious text: literal, historical and symbolic questions

Epigraph

> *The heavens declare the glory of God;*

Psalm 19:1, first clause, King James Version. The psalm continues with sun imagery, law and prayer.

What this article is about

A religious text can invite several questions at once. What do its words say? What circumstances might help us understand them? What does an image mean within a particular tradition? What would I like to do after reading? These questions need not compete, but an answer to one does not automatically answer the others. A personal response cannot establish an event in the past; identifying a metaphor cannot settle a question of faith. This article considers bounded biblical passages, a chapter of Augustine, and three Quranic verses in identified English translations. It offers distinctions for a respectful reading conversation, rather than a single interpretive method binding every religion. The reader may approach the material through faith, research, uncertainty, or a combination of these. Naming the question and the grounds for an answer helps preserve both the text's particular setting and the reader's freedom to continue.

I. Different questions can begin with the same words

Imagine two participants at an invented reading meeting. One brings a short religious narrative because she wants to understand its sequence. Another hopes it will help him consider a personal choice. They read the same words but ask different questions. The first asks who speaks and what happens within the narrative. The second asks how what he hears relates to his life. Both questions are possible. A dispute begins when an answer to one is presented as the answer to the other. Personal recognition does not establish a historical fact, while identifying a character does not yet resolve a personal difficulty. Naming the question can precede demanding agreement with a conclusion.

In this article, literal attention means attending to what words express in their genre and context. It does not require asserting that every sentence describes an event that actually occurred. We can identify a parable's characters and sequence without treating it as a discovered incident report. A historical question adds an inquiry into the circumstances of

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

composition, transmission, and the text's world. Symbolic interpretation seeks the meaning of an image or relation within a specified understanding. These are working definitions introduced here. Traditions may use the terms differently, so our small vocabulary is not presented as a standard on which they have all agreed.

Personal application adds another step: the reader chooses what to do after reading. That choice may draw on religious conviction, reflection, or conversation. The transition still needs a name. "This story prompted me to discuss assistance" describes my decision. "This text requires everyone here to do precisely what I propose" makes a broader demand. Personal impression alone cannot establish that demand. The distinction does not dismiss spiritual experience. It helps us recognise when we are discussing an experience, explaining a text, or introducing a requirement that affects another person's freedom. Those activities can be related without becoming interchangeable.

II. Poetic language remains religious language

At the beginning of Psalm 19 in the King James Version, the heavens declare God's glory. The speech of day and night is followed by an image of the sun resembling a bridegroom and a strong runner. The consulted text continues with law, commandments, the speaker's faults, and prayer. An image cannot therefore be detached from that movement and presented as an independent account of how the cosmos works. We can recognise a poetic comparison while remaining attentive to religious assertion and prayerful address. Poetic language does not mean that a believer must regard the text as decorative feeling with no object beyond itself.

Suppose a participant at our invented meeting asks whether the sun actually leaves a bridegroom's chamber. We can return to the wording of the comparison. It does not require us to locate such a chamber in the observable sky. Yet that clarification cannot itself decide how a reader understands God's glory or the relation of creation and Creator. A question about the form of speech differs from a question of faith. There is no need to turn them into a contest in which recognising an image settles every religious issue, or preserving faith requires refusing to notice comparison. Both conclusions add something beyond the analysis of the selected words.

Nor does this psalm establish that every difficult sentence in a religious book should be declared metaphorical. The genre and arrangement of the particular passage matter. Here the comparison is signalled in the wording and supported by surrounding images. Another passage needs its own examination. A symbolic interpretation gains grounds from the text and its interpretive setting, rather than merely from a desire to avoid a difficulty. If the grounds have not yet been found, a reader can identify a proposed interpretation and an open question. Continued reading then remains possible without either rejecting the entire work or announcing a first guess as its final meaning.

III. Read a narrative together with its interlocutor’s question

Luke 10:25–37 begins with a question about eternal life, turns to what is written in the law and love of God and neighbour, and introduces a question about who one’s neighbour is. The story follows: a man suffers an attack, others pass him, and a Samaritan helps. At the end, Jesus asks who proved neighbour to the injured person; the interlocutor’s reply concerns mercy. Beginning and ending alter the role of the narrative between them. Keeping only the road and the actions would lose part of the question the story answers. This limited observation can be made by reading the bounded passage as a whole.

Literal attention here includes distinguishing voices. One interlocutor asks questions; the other tells the story and gives the closing address. The interlocutor’s answer also occupies a particular place. If a compiler puts a brief final sentence in a handout without attribution, it can appear to be the compiler’s command. Restoring the speaker and preceding question helps avoid that confusion. A source does not become our speech simply because we agree with it. The article’s quotation retains its origin. We can discuss its meaning without deciding unilaterally that every contemporary reader has become a participant in the original conversation.

Contemporary application remains a separate question. A reader may wish to consider helping someone outside a familiar circle. Another may investigate the narrative’s arrangement. We do not establish what historical events lie behind it, assess every relationship between groups of that period, or derive a present assistance procedure from every detail. Those inquiries require appropriate materials. Our observation concerns the written conversation: a movement from asking about the neighbour to action and an answer concerning mercy. It preserves the religious frame rather than turning the parable into a neutral example of contemporary management. A later application needs its own stated transition.

IV. A historical question extends the grounds required

The story names Jerusalem, Jericho, a priest, a Levite, and a Samaritan. Establishing that these names occur in the consulted text is one task. Explaining duties, routes, and relationships during a particular historical period is another. The latter needs checked information, comparison of sources, and a boundary around the reconstruction. A familiar name alone is insufficient. We do not undertake such a reconstruction here. The distinction matters in reading: an internal narrative detail can prompt a question about the text’s world without providing the complete answer. A reader can stop at the first level and identify that limit honestly, or choose a further inquiry.

Historical explanation does not automatically cancel religious understanding either. If grounds for understanding a custom are found later, they clarify that custom and perhaps a detail’s

meaning. They do not decide whether a person recognises the text as sacred. Conversely, recognising a text as sacred does not verify every modern reconstruction of its past. We can respect both questions and ask precisely what the discovered material supports. Information about a road may not establish a character's motives. Information about a language may not establish a narrated event. Explanations of different kinds need grounds proportionate to the claims they introduce into the conversation.

Our imagined group might record three columns in an ordinary note: textual detail, proposed explanation, and grounds for that explanation. If the third column remains empty, the second remains a hypothesis. This does not prohibit hypotheses; it makes their status visible. Participants can seek material later or return to the composition of the story itself. Historical interest does not require saying more than has been checked. It begins with distinguishing the available text from the picture of the past we construct. That boundary permits knowledge to expand while each new transition remains open to examination, rather than disappearing into a confident retelling.

There is also a difference between the time of an event within a story and the date of an available textual witness. Even if a reader later finds a manuscript's dating, that date concerns the manuscript first and needs its own grounds. It cannot automatically date every described event. Equally, a recently published translation does not make an ancient text newly composed. No such dating is undertaken here. The distinction helps us ask what is being dated: an object, a record, a translation, or a proposed event. A particular witness can matter while remaining evidence at a particular level, rather than supplying a finished history of everything read.

V. Symbolic reading has criteria and a domain

In On Christian Doctrine, Book III, Chapter 10, Augustine warns against mistakes in both directions: figurative language should not automatically be taken literally, or literal language figuratively. His criterion belongs to a Christian understanding of life, doctrine, love, and knowledge of God and neighbour. This is a particular theological position, rather than a method without premises for every religion. The James Shaw translation in the identified New Advent edition was consulted. It lets us consider what supports an interpretation. It does not make Augustine's criterion obligatory for a reader of another tradition, or turn his chapter into a contemporary experiment measuring reading effectiveness.

In that chapter Augustine also discusses the danger of treating one's customs and opinions as the measure of interpretation. A limited question follows for our meeting: have we chosen a symbolic explanation merely because a literal meaning is uncomfortable? The answer needs a particular case. Perhaps nearby words support the image; perhaps the explanation depends on an identified theological commentary; perhaps it presently expresses a reader's wish. Those

grounds should be distinguished. Disagreeing with an interpretation does not authorise attributing hidden corruption to a person. Our question concerns the grounds of an explanation, rather than a diagnosis of its proposer's character.

Augustine's text also belongs to a historical context containing polemical evaluations of other forms of belief and reading. We do not transfer those evaluations to contemporary peoples, persons, or traditions. Taking a narrow question from a broader system is possible if the boundary is acknowledged. The article therefore does not pretend that Augustine offered only a neutral literary technique. He considers Scripture within his religious position. Our comparison is limited: literal and figurative meanings should not be assigned arbitrarily, and a criterion needs explaining. The contemporary conditions for respectful discussion are proposed by this article's authors, rather than attributed to the historical author as his complete teaching.

VI. Acknowledging obscurity within faith

In Quran 3:7 as displayed in Pickthall's English translation, clear revelations are distinguished from others rendered as allegorical, followed by discussion of interpretation and faith. The neighbouring verses, 3:8–9, include prayerful address and a future day of gathering. This retains the passage's religious setting. It is not general permission for a reader to give any text any meaning. We consulted the bounded translated passage, rather than deciding disputes between interpretations or surveying the entire tradition. The material supports a question about clarity and the limits of interpretation. It does not support announcing a single account of how every Muslim reader understands these verses.

Comparing this fragment with Augustine does not turn them into an identical doctrine. Augustine's criterion in the consulted chapter is tied to his Christian understanding of love and doctrine. The Quranic passage has its own religious address and distinctions. We can notice the question of interpretive limits without making the answers interchangeable. For a contemporary reader, a bounded parallel remains possible: not everything obscure is settled by a first explanation, and proposed explanations need identified grounds. Each tradition's answer should be considered through appropriate material. Similarity in one question gives no authority to declare its entire meaning already known and identical to another tradition's response.

A person in an ordinary conversation can acknowledge not understanding a passage and continue regarding it as sacred. Another can leave the religious question open and study the translation. Neither choice requires accepting someone else's guess because it was expressed confidently. Obscurity and disagreement do not mean that all interpretations have equal support either. Readers can seek linguistic explanation, a commentary within their tradition, or historical material, identifying the question each addresses. Recognising a limit to

understanding should not quietly become either a promise of complete knowledge or permission for arbitrary meaning. It can remain a specific statement of what is unresolved.

VII. Translation belongs to the material being read

Here the psalm and Gospel passage were read in the King James Version, Augustine in Shaw's English translation, and the Quranic verses in Pickthall's English translation. The short Russian quotations were translated by the article authors from the identified English wording. This is not direct reading in Hebrew, Greek, Latin, or Arabic. Identifying mediation does not dismiss a translation. It makes the wording actually discussed recoverable and prevents attributing every feature of a Russian rendering to the ancient original. Another translation may present a question differently. Comparing it requires locating its specific passage rather than making only a general remark that translations can be inaccurate.

Sometimes a difference appears in punctuation. In the displayed translations of Quran 3:7, the division of a sentence affects the relation between knowledge and the ensuing statement of faith. This is an observation about English versions, not an independent settlement of the Arabic question. We therefore do not build an entire account of a religion on one comma. If that transition matters to the reader, an appropriate linguistic and theological examination is a possible next step. Here the limitation needs preserving. "I notice a translation difference" and "I established the correct doctrine" name different results and require different grounds.

Checking a brief quotation also has a defined purpose. It can confirm that the selected words appear in the identified edition and belong to the named speaker. It does not yet check every interpretation, the book's authorship, or the narrative's historical accuracy. Accurate citation helps a conversation without delivering its final meaning. At the meeting, participants can first correct an attribution, then discuss meaning, and separately decide whether another translation is needed. Every small correction need not become a rejection of the whole spiritual subject. Identify the uncertainty that was resolved and the uncertainty that remains, so that the result of checking stays proportionate.

VIII. An image does not license unlimited explanation

A symbolic interpretation needs an accessible transition from the words to the proposed meaning. A reader can point to a nearby image, a repeated relation within the text, or an identified commentary of a particular tradition. Personal impression can also be named while retaining personal status. If the psalm compares the sun to a bridegroom, the text itself supports discussing imagery. If someone claims every detail encodes the precise date of a future event, quite different grounds are needed. Symbolic language does not certify every later decoding. This is our principle for responsible discussion, rather than a claim that we have examined all religious systems of interpretation.

We can also compare ways of examining an interpretation. Does it fit the surrounding passage? Does it exchange speakers' roles? Does it retain the question under discussion? Is the proposer of the transition identified? These questions do not promise to produce the sole interpretation automatically. They help identify the material supporting discussion. Several interpretations can remain open while others lack adequate grounds. Preserving uncertainty means describing that situation, rather than making everything equal. A reader can respect another person's faith without declaring every explanatory account equally supported by the same textual features. Respect and assessment of a specific explanation can coexist.

Our imagined group might find a symbolic interpretation interesting but not yet supported by an appropriate commentary. Participants can retain it as a question, avoid making it a rule for others, and continue reading. If a source is found later, they can identify the tradition and scope in which the interpretation gained grounds. Its status can change without every other question disappearing. Developing understanding does not require retrospectively calling an initial guess established knowledge. The movement from impression to an identified interpretation can be described briefly and plainly. Its purpose is to make the grounds accessible, rather than require an endless record of every reading action.

Distinguishing the ancient author from the author of an explanation also helps. If a contemporary participant connects an image with her own situation, her words should remain attributed to her proposal. If the explanation comes from a commentary, identify that commentary and passage. Attribution does not itself prove correctness, but it makes discussion and checking possible. Without it, a personal account can quietly acquire the voice of an entire tradition. At our meeting someone can say, "This is the transition I propose; these are the words I see; the question of general doctrine remains open." Clear authorship lets even a disagreement continue without requiring participants to accept explanation as text.

IX. Application belongs to the reader as well

After reading a story about mercy, someone may wish to speak differently to a person previously overlooked. That is a possible personal application. It does not establish that every narrative detail should be replaced by a contemporary role, or guarantee the conversation's result. Present circumstances and the other person's consent matter in their own right. A reader might begin with a small question, choose suitable assistance, or continue reflecting. No obligatory procedure for an unfamiliar situation is proposed here. The historical text retains its question; our decision concerns present conditions and requires its own responsibility. Connection does not erase that difference.

If a participant wants to make his application obligatory for the group, another conversation begins. He needs to name the proposal and its grounds rather than hide them behind a short quotation. Agreement with the value of mercy does not imply agreement with every means of assistance someone chooses. People may share a religious understanding and differ about actions. They may belong to different traditions and find an acceptable shared undertaking. Conditions, consequences, and freedom to participate matter to that decision. Comparing texts can support discussion without granting one interpreter additional authority over everyone else's personal choices. A common value leaves the proposal open to examination.

The boundary also matters when someone declines. A person may choose not to join a reading exercise or discuss personal faith publicly. That does not establish spiritual maturity or a lack of compassion. We do not use a historical image to make such assessments. Content can remain a subject of inquiry without requiring disclosure of personal experience. An adult conversation permits clarification, agreement, disagreement, and silence. These contemporary conditions are proposed by this article's authors. They are not presented as the single historical rule of every religion considered here. They clarify how we suggest using the comparison now, with participants retaining their own choices.

X. Several horizons without one compulsory conclusion

A precise question distinguishes the results of reading. We may have restored a speaker, noticed a poetic comparison, clarified a theological criterion, or understood our own reason for acting. These are different gains. None needs diminishing because it does not settle every other question. Neither should it be enlarged beyond its grounds. Reading a few lines does not become complete knowledge of a tradition; recognising an image does not become historical proof; a useful action does not certify every detail of the interpretation chosen. Naming the result lets discussion continue from the point where knowledge appeared, rather than from a general demand for final certainty.

The psalm, Gospel conversation, Augustine, and selected Quranic passage show different relations between words, faith, imagery, and understanding. Comparing them does not announce that all religions say the same thing. It identifies a reading question while preserving different answers and settings. Historical reconstruction, linguistic checking, and adjudication between commentaries need corresponding sources. The need for further inquiry does not make a consulted passage useless. It can already supply a bounded question and enough material to identify more accurately what remains missing. A limited result can be valuable without being turned into a complete account of the tradition from which it came.

Participants at our invented meeting may leave with different personal conclusions and shared clarity about the passage read. One continues prayerful reading, another seeks historical explanation, and a third compares translations. Reading together does not require one compulsory experience. It requires sufficient honesty about words, grounds, and the limits of proposals. Literal, historical, and symbolic questions can then support one another without automatically replacing one another. A religious text remains a possible object of faith and study. A free reader retains the possibility of listening, asking, and choosing the next step, including leaving a question open while continuing elsewhere.

What this means in practice

Choose a short passage you already wish to read, and identify its translation or edition. Read it with its nearby beginning and ending. Record the speaker, genre, and one question about words, historical circumstances, imagery, or your life. These questions can be considered in sequence; they need not all be settled immediately.

Separate three notes: what appears in the text, what is proposed as explanation, and what you wish to do yourself. Name the explanation’s grounds: surrounding words, an identified commentary, or personal impression. If the grounds remain unknown, retain the interpretation as a question. Clarifying a translation does not automatically settle a theological dispute.

Finish with one next step: read further context, seek an appropriate commentary, compare an identified translation, or retain an open question. Do not demand another person’s disclosure or agreement with your application. Participation is optional. This is an authorial reading exercise, not a measured technique for spiritual development or a replacement for linguistic, historical, or theological inquiry. A possible result is a clearer question and a more visible boundary around the available answer, while preserving respect for the text and each participant’s freedom.

Key quotation

> *Go, and do thou likewise.*

Luke 10:37, Jesus's closing sentence after the neighbour question and reply concerning mercy; King James Version. Speaker and conversational setting retained.

Connections between traditions

1. **Psalm 19 / Luke 10:25–37:** religious poetry and a conversation containing a narrative call for attention to different forms of speech. An image does not become an incident report, and a parable retains its religious question.

2. **Augustine / the psalm:** distinguishing literal and figurative reading raises a question about criteria. Augustine's criterion is theological; our attention to comparison does not establish every traditional interpretation of the psalm.

3. **Augustine / Quran 3:7–9:** both passages permit discussion of limits on arbitrary explanation. Christian criteria and the Quranic relation of interpretation, faith and prayer retain their differences; no identical doctrine is inferred.

4. **Four sources / translations:** identified English editions mediate access here. This is a shared route of reading rather than identical traditions; Russian quotations are our renderings via English.

5. **Religious text / personal application:** grounds for explanation and a choice of action are considered separately. The voluntary exercise and contemporary discussion conditions are authorial, rather than attributed to every historical tradition.

Primary sources

1. Psalm 19, King James Version, verses 1–14. Entire psalm consulted in this English edition; imagery, law and prayer considered together.

2. Luke 10:25–37, King James Version. Complete bounded conversation and narrative consulted, from opening question to closing address.

3. Augustine. On Christian Doctrine, III, Chapter 10, §§14–16; James Shaw, NPNF First Series, vol2 (1887), New Advent revised display. Theological criteria retain their domain.

4. Quran 3:7–9, Pickthall English translation: complete bounded translated passage consulted in primary-text search display. Direct page opening failed; Arabic and tafsir not collated.

Tags

religious text, reading, literal meaning, historical question, symbol, interpretation, translation, context, genre, speaker, psalm, Gospel of Luke, parable, mercy, Augustine, Christian doctrine, Quran, Pickthall, Shaw, King James Version, faith, prayer, source, commentary, uncertainty, personal application, voluntary participation, dialogue, respect, reading exercise

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.