

UNITED WISDOM

The text’s silence: what we supply for its author

World and Consciousness

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

W-04-N04 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

The text’s silence: what we supply for its author

Epigraph

> *Such is the influence of custom*

David Hume, An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding, SectionIV, PartI, §24, opening phrase of the paragraph's final sentence. Its original subject is customary inference about causes and effects; applying it to reading here is an explicitly identified analogy.

What this article is about

A text communicates less than readers can see in it. We connect events, suppose causes, imagine an addressee, and give meaning to what remains unnamed. Such work helps us understand even a short letter. Yet our additions can become indistinguishable from an author's words: a useful guess becomes a quotation, an omitted detail a hidden prohibition, and a familiar plot a proven intention. This article examines the boundary between reading and supplying what is missing. Aristotle's distinction between utterances, Locke's linguistic uncertainty, Hume's argument about custom, and Augustine's discussion of what Moses intended help frame the questions. These historical texts do not establish a universal experimental mechanism of reader behaviour. The practical aim is to distinguish what is written, what can reasonably be inferred, and what remains our hypothesis. Silence need not prevent understanding; it should not become unlimited permission to speak for someone we cannot question.

I. A third sentence appears between two written ones

Imagine a brief note: “After the conversation, Anna left. Boris remained in the garden.” Readers may see a quarrel, reluctance to meet, or simply different plans. None is yet named. The sequence gives two events and a temporal connection to a conversation; the departure's cause requires further support. This invented example does not train us to uncover hidden feelings. It makes an added transition visible. Retelling the note as “Anna was offended and therefore left” introduces another step. Later evidence might establish it, but plausibility does not insert it into the original note. Interpretation has occurred, and readers should recognize which addition they themselves are responsible for rather than silently crediting it to the writer.

These transitions are part of ordinary reading. Authors do not list every circumstance surrounding every action: a short story would lose its form. We use language and contextual

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

knowledge to recover connections. The task is therefore not prohibiting inference. Distinguish its support: some conclusions follow an explicit statement, some draw on nearby context, and others remain one guess among alternatives. This is a working distinction for the article, not a universal classification of literary theory. It permits questions about a particular passage: why choose this transition, which detail supports it, and what could change our understanding? Examination begins with named grounds rather than the impossible requirement to read without any assumptions at all.

A guess may persuade because it completes a story. A cause explains departure, a feeling joins replies, and a moral closes an event. Completion for the reader and textual confirmation are nevertheless different results. A reading can be valuable while retaining its status. “I see a possible quarrel here” leaves an alternative open; “the author said they quarrelled” requires evidence. This matters beyond scholarly precision. Applied to a real person, the unnoticed transition assigns a motive. In literary discussion it can be part of creative reading. Naming the purpose helps determine a claim's strength, while preserving a distinction between imaginative freedom and responsibility for a public retelling in which another person's words provide the apparent authority.

II. First identify the work a phrase is doing

In Part4 of On Interpretation, Aristotle distinguishes meaningful speech from a proposition carrying truth or falsity. His example of a prayer has meaning without being such an assertion. This selected logical distinction is used here without treating the entire ancient work as a ready-made contemporary reading theory. It suggests a prior question: is the phrase a factual report, request, question, image, or evaluation? Treating every form as an equivalent factual description produces claims the text never made. “Let there be quiet” does not report that quiet already arrived; the title “the road home” establishes no particular route. A word's significance does not by itself determine the type of inference it permits.

This caution helps within literary and religious works. An image may disclose a relationship without explaining a physical mechanism; an address may express hope without establishing an outcome; a question may reveal difficulty without asserting its only answer. These are proposed distinctions rather than exhaustive genre definitions. Applying them requires neighbouring lines and the text's construction. An isolated sentence often cannot identify its complete purpose. A narrator may pose a question later rejected or transmit another person's evaluation. Readers may discuss its significance, but attributing a final authorial position needs another step. That step is where an unnoticed addition often enters, as a memorable sentence starts replacing the entire movement of an argument that gave it its particular role.

Our response also deserves a name. If an image helps me understand something, I can say so without establishing that it was designed for the same purpose. The distinction retains

expressiveness and accuracy together. Encountering a work need not reproduce every thought of its historical author, but cannot merge a personal response with a report of intention. This limit enriches comparison: several responses can be considered beside the elements supporting them. Rejecting one mandatory experience does not make every assertion about a text equally grounded. We can respond freely to an image and check a quotation carefully because these are different actions, with different evidential demands and different possible consequences of error.

III. A true thought and an author's intention need different grounds

In the selected paragraphs of Confessions BookXII, Augustine distinguishes disagreement about a thing's truth from disagreement about what its reporter meant. His discussion concerns Genesis, faith in Scripture's truth, and Moses. Removing that theological setting would turn the passage into a contemporary slogan endorsing every interpretation equally, which it does not provide. A narrower distinction matters here: confidence in a thought need not provide equal confidence that a historical author intended precisely that thought. Augustine explicitly marks his inability to see another's mind. The selected context was read in E.B. Pusey's translation. Neither the entire theological argument nor an experimental science of intention is claimed to have been assessed through it.

Contemporary readers can use the distinction without extending those theological premises to every work. We may find a thought we consider useful or true and separately investigate whether a passage expresses it. If it does, a question about the strength of intentional attribution remains. Authors might pursue a narrower task, leave several possibilities open, or never consider our application. A missing answer is not supplied by confidence in our conclusion's value. The hypothetical garden note might inspire substantial reflection about solitude. That reflection's usefulness does not establish that solitude was its writer's intended subject. Readers can keep their result while relinquishing only the unsupported assignment of their own thought to another person's authorial voice.

The reverse distinction matters too: established intention does not make every authorial thought true. Historical evidence about a letter's purpose helps understand the letter; evaluating its claim requires separate reasons. The tasks may support one another without merging. Preserved explanations should be considered; absent ones leave a limit to name. We need not choose between complete access to another's mind and total impossibility of understanding. There is intermediate work with form, context, recurrence, and explicit indications. Its result may be definite enough for a chosen question. Do not strengthen a conclusion merely to end a dispute, or erase supported understanding because a stronger question remains open and requires evidence unavailable in the selected passage.

IV. A familiar word leaves room for unfamiliar content

In EssayIII.IX.8–9, Locke discusses limits of common usage and learning names of complex concepts. Familiar words may assist conversation without fixing an identical precise content in speaker and listener. This is a selected philosophical argument, not a verified account of every child's development or a contemporary language survey. It helps where readers fill a word with their own familiar meaning. “Gratitude” already suggests an action, feeling, obligation, or good upbringing to us, although a particular argument might use only one element. Until its use is examined, the word's accessibility can conceal what remains unknown about the concept instead of finally removing that uncertainty and establishing agreement about every implication.

Imagine a text where “freedom” concerns declining an invitation. A reader might supply a political programme or a doctrine excluding every limitation. Those ideas need not be meaningless, but they exceed this passage's scale. An honest conclusion requires a transition linking the local case to the general claim. Without one, discuss a personal association or seek more context. A large word's familiarity is not ready evidence. Notice negations, definitions, and examples: they constrain usage more strongly than a term's general emotional impression. Retaining a qualification sometimes changes the reading's entire result, although the central word remains the same and appears equally expressive in both retellings. What changes is the scope of the claim readers are entitled to make.

An unfamiliar term makes difficulty visible; a familiar one can hide it. This does not require suspecting every simple phrase. A proportionate question suffices where a word carries the main conclusion. What does it name here, what opposes it, and which example fits or fails? An answer can be short when context is clear. Otherwise retain alternatives without calling each an authorial definition. This approach need not produce a dictionary on every page. We investigate one transition rather than trying to eliminate all linguistic uncertainty in advance. A reader's question remains substantive even when no uniquely final answer is available for unrestricted transfer to every situation in which the same familiar word might later appear.

V. A familiar cause can seem to have been written

In EnquirySectionIV, PartI, §§23–24, Hume considers how causal knowledge depends on experience and how familiar events come to seem understandable without it. His selected philosophical argument concerns inference, not a measured mechanism in a reader's brain. Applying it to reading is our analogy: a familiar plot may supply a cause so quickly that the added step disappears. Someone leaves after a conversation, so the conversation offended them. The sequence is recognizable, but the original note has not established that explanation. Confidence may rest on familiarity; a claim about this event needs relevant context. The source reveals a question about foundations without verifying a particular guess or allowing every causal connection to be inferred from temporal succession alone.

Distinguish probability from necessity. Experience of similar events with a particular cause may make that cause a working hypothesis. It does not eliminate every alternative. A text may add a direct reply, a narrator's explanation, or a later clarification. New information can then strengthen the inference. Without those signs, “there is no other explanation” cannot replace them. It often identifies our imagination's limit rather than an event's possibilities. This article proposes logical caution, not the impossibility of understanding causes. A probable explanation can be used in discussion if its supporting circumstances are named, together with the missing evidence preventing it from being called uniquely established. The difference remains meaningful even when the preferred hypothesis eventually proves correct.

Moral retelling makes the habit conspicuous. Expecting a lesson about retribution can turn a character's later misfortune into deserved punishment. The writer might instead convey chance, ambiguity, or their own perplexity. Before completing a story with a convenient moral, locate that moral and examine contrary details. Its absence does not make the work empty: it can leave something to consider. We do not claim every gap was deliberately made profound; information may simply be limited. Neither possibility entitles readers to close it with their only familiar formula. Retained uncertainty allows discussion without an invisible verdict we supplied and subsequently attributed to an author, character, or tradition, changing the apparent grounds of the argument.

VI. What is unmentioned is not automatically rejected

A work may omit something because it addresses another question. A short meeting-time letter does not provide an entire relationship history. Naming one action does not always deny alternatives. Inferring prohibition from silence needs support: promised completeness, an explicit restriction, or a context where absence is significant. This is conditional reasoning about reading, not universal legal interpretation. Distinguish “it is not said” from “it says that it is absent.” The former leaves a question open; the latter makes a negative assertion. Replacing one with the other gives the work a position its author did not assume in the selected passage. The resulting dispute may concern our addition rather than an actual disagreement between statements the text contains.

The reverse error is possible: silence does not certify agreement. A missing objection in a short preserved passage does not prove support for everything contemporary readers attach to it. Describing an opportunity to leave does not endorse every reason for departure. Evidence must identify the actual question. A neutral conclusion is available: this passage does not settle it. That is not evasive when the question exceeds the source. It preserves further inquiry. Another passage, an authorial letter, or contextual research may supply support. Confidence about how the writer “must surely have thought” does not suffice, particularly when silence is being used for a broad claim about the person's views and their supposed implications for others.

Absence can nonetheless carry meaning. If an author promises every condition and omits one, that omission may matter within the declared list. The foundation is not the gap alone, but its relation to promised completeness. Even then, examine the text's structure and possible missing portions. No specific manuscript reconstruction is attempted here. The imagined example shows that inference from absence is possible but requires an argument. Neither automatic prohibition nor automatic permission helps. “Why was a mention expected here?” makes a hidden premise visible. Another reader can then agree, qualify its scale, or show that the selected text never assumed that task. This converts an apparently self-evident silence into a question that can actually be examined.

VII. A modern example brings its own conditions

Transferring an old thought to familiar circumstances can reveal meaning if the transition is identified. A contemporary example nevertheless adds working arrangements, relationships, contractual significance, or communication habits of its own. Those conditions do not automatically belong to the original work. Explaining an ancient journey image through current planning may help, but does not establish that the author proposed precisely that plan. Name the example's task: it illustrates one relationship. Then identify what cannot transfer. Similar form does not make all circumstances identical. This boundary allows historical texts to be used today without treating them as prepared answers to questions that their selected passages did not ask or settle for the people now consulting them.

The garden, note, and invitation in this article serve the same purpose. They are not research observations proving Aristotle, Locke, Hume, or Augustine. They display a transition between evidence and conclusion. Other examples may replace them if the relevant relationship survives. That offers a useful analogy check: what remains important after everyday details are changed? If the entire conclusion depends on an emotional image, ask whether the image supplied a missing reason. A distinction that survives can be illuminated by the example. Yet even a good illustration neither attributes our decision to a historical source nor exempts our application from separate discussion in the circumstances that prompted us to read in the first place.

Practical use therefore needs two addresses: a source location and a place in our own reasoning. We know where a distinction came from and what we propose doing with it. Someone can accept the first while declining the second. That need not indicate misunderstanding or disrespect for tradition; the application may overlook their circumstances. Keeping the boundary allows a different example or action without rewriting the old text's meaning for convenience. It matters when reading accompanies advice to another person. A work's authority cannot replace consent to participate in a proposed practice. We can offer a question without turning our supplementation into a mandatory rule supposedly established for someone by a historical author and requiring only obedience.

VIII. Several readings need different degrees of confidence

Multiple interpretations are not necessarily equivalent. One may rest on an explicit definition, another on a recurring image, and another on personal association alone. Describe each accordingly. Place a reading beside its foundation. Disagreement then concerns something definite: does this image support that conclusion, is nearby context sufficient, or does a following sentence contradict it? Overall taste gives way to discussion of a connection's strength. Agreement is not promised, but a supported alternative remains distinguishable from arbitrary substitution. Reader freedom gains substance when it includes explaining one's choice rather than merely demanding unquestioning acceptance as equal to every other option, regardless of what the work itself makes available for assessment.

A preliminary conclusion can stand without settling everything. “This passage permits this reading” differs from “the author intended only this.” Work lies between them. An explicit restriction excluding an option should be acknowledged; insufficient evidence may leave the debate open. Historical commentary can help, but its explanation must also connect to a source. No complete hermeneutical survey or criterion for every work is offered here. The modest discipline concerns confidence growing with support rather than repetition of our preferred version. This leaves room to revise a thought without feeling that revision destroys all previous reading experience. Some of that experience may remain valuable even when a particular attribution needs correction or further evidence before being repeated publicly.

Distinguish meaningful possibility from factual testimony. A literary line may inspire a philosophical thought without documenting its author's biography. A letter may reveal a message without every internal reason for its wording. A theological passage may clarify an argument without proving its premises to every reader. Different objects need different foundations. Moving a conclusion between them requires new support. Calling everything “interpretation” cannot erase accuracy's demands. A useful interpretation identifies its activity: explaining a sentence, proposing a response, recovering context, or asserting a fact. Its result can then be considered at the appropriate scale, rather than being assigned authority over every other question merely because all those questions arose during an encounter with the same work.

IX. A retelling's consequences determine how deeply to check

A personal impression often needs only an acknowledged personal voice. Publicly assigning someone a motive or doctrine requires firmer foundations. Proportion concerns consequences: a private note can be corrected quickly, while a formulation repeated in an author's name may inform others' judgments. Before a strong retelling, examine the location, nearby paragraphs, and boundary between quotation and inference. This is no demand for endless investigation of every line. The particular claim determines the needed work. One preserved context may suffice, or another edition and competent help may be necessary. If support is unavailable, narrow the assertion to what it sustains instead of increasing confidence for a finished presentation that conceals precisely what remains unestablished.

An identified error benefits from a precise correction. Name the addition, show the passage, and revise the inference. There is no need to declare an entire work incomprehensible or appeal to language's universal complexity. If departure was explained as offence and the note gives no cause, restore it to a hypothesis. That preserves the stated events and removes only the unsupported step. Further reading matters if the cause is the main question; otherwise the correction can suffice for an honest retelling. This is a proposed structure of responsibility, not an empirically established editing technique. It makes grounds and changes visible, showing which question remains unresolved and which can now be discussed without the previous substitution.

Another reader helps most with a particular question. “Have I understood everything?” is broad; “does this paragraph support that cause?” supplies a definite shared task. A reply can identify context, alternatives, or missing support. Independent reading guarantees neither final truth nor authorial intention through agreement between two people. It makes an unnoticed addition discussable. Allow disagreement without demanding endorsement as loyalty. Examination serves a thought when its result can alter the formulation. If every observation is dismissed in advance, the procedure merely decorates prior certainty and ceases to distinguish the work, argument, and reteller's own desire. The important freedom is therefore not immunity from correction, but the ability to retain supported content while revising the unsupported part.

X. A gap can remain while understanding becomes sufficient

Reading need not produce a complete picture. Sometimes identifying the question, proposed distinctions, and remaining uncertainty is enough. This is not surrender. A real result is retained without enlargement beyond access. The hypothetical note establishes Anna's departure and Boris's presence; its cause may stay open. A philosophical passage may clearly distinguish utterances while its new application remains debatable. Such a result can guide a next step: find context, ask a question, or narrow a retelling. Sufficiency depends on the chosen task, not a requirement that a work answer every thought occurring after our encounter with it. Recognizing that limit can help preserve what has genuinely been understood instead of discarding it for lack of complete certainty.

The four sources retain different aspects. Aristotle distinguishes meaningful speech and assertion; Locke asks about a familiar word's content; Hume examines the foundation of customary inference; Augustine distinguishes confidence in a thought from confidence in intention within his theological setting. They are not four equivalent confirmations of an experimental reading theory. Their methods, purposes, and premises differ. United Wisdom's comparison keeps those boundaries. No promise is made to reveal every work's hidden intention. The proposal is to make our supplementation visible when it carries an important conclusion. Readers can then use imagination while accepting responsibility for what they say in another person's name, without requiring historical sources to validate every modern application.

A text's silence can invite an attentive question. What is unreported, why did I expect it, and which transition did I supply? Answers may return us to the source, our own experience, or missing evidence. Each direction helps when distinguished. A gap need not be filled solely to make a story smooth. An expressive response can remain a response; a hypothesis can stay revisable; written events can be transmitted without an invisible motive. Authors then do not carry every inference, and readers retain their own work. Between them remains conversational space where understanding grows from a passage and named grounds, rather than from confidence that succeeded in concealing the words we ourselves added to it.

What this means in practice

Choose a short neutral letter or passage you already intended to read. Copy one sentence exactly and place a desired inference beside it. Identify the transition: explicit, supported by neighbouring context, or still hypothetical? Avoid describing the author's entire personality from this small selection. The aim is to find your added step, not reconstruct every possible circumstance of the writing.

Offer one alternative if it genuinely fits the passage. Identify a detail that could distinguish the options. If none is available, keep the question open. A missing answer should become neither prohibition nor agreement. Retain a limited result and decide whether additional context is needed for your current task. An unresolved motive need not erase an explicitly stated event.

Retell the passage so another reader can distinguish quotation, inference, and personal response. If useful, ask them to examine one particular transition. This voluntary editorial exercise has no established efficacy and tests no general capacity to understand. Stop when the chosen question is clear enough. Ordinary reading need not become complete investigation of an author's biography or every possible meaning of a work.

Key quotation

> *one, concerning the truth of the things, the other, concerning the meaning of the relater.*

Augustine, Confessions BookXII, paragraph beginning “These things then being heard and perceived,” selected part of E.B. Pusey's sentence. Its setting is theological interpretation of Genesis, not endorsement of every interpretation as equally true.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Connections between traditions

Comparison	Shared question	Boundary
Aristotle, On Interpretation4; Augustine, ConfessionsXII	How does an assertion's object differ from another question?	A logical speech type is not the theological distinction of truth and intention.
Aristotle4; LockeIII.IX.8–9	What does a meaningful phrase communicate?	Utterance type and a complex concept's precision concern different levels.
Aristotle4; HumeIV.I.23–24	When do words support an inference?	Classifying speech cannot establish a cause; causal argument does not determine genre.
LockeIII.IX.8–9; AugustineXII	How does familiar understanding relate to another's meaning?	Common-word uncertainty differs from Moses's intention within Augustine's faith.
LockeIII.IX.8–9; HumeIV.I.23–24	How can familiarity conceal missing grounds?	Word usage and customary causal inference address different philosophical tasks.
AugustineXII; HumeIV.I.23–24	Why should confidence identify its foundation?	Inaccessible intention and experience of causality do not form one reading theory.

Primary sources

1. Aristotle. On Interpretation, Part4, E.M. Edghill English translation, MIT Classics. Complete selected meaningful-speech/proposition passage read. No Greek collation or comprehensive contemporary genre theory inferred.

2. John Locke. An Essay Concerning Humane Understanding, vol.2, III.IX.8–9, Gutenberg10616, historical English text. Selected common-usage/complex-name sections and neighbouring context actually read. No complete-book reading or modern empirical validation of language development claimed.

3. David Hume. An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding, SectionIV, PartI, §§23–24. L.A. Selby-Bigge edition1902, following posthumous1777 text, Gutenberg9662. Selected experience/custom argument actually read. Its application to reading is editorial analogy, not experimental neuroscience.

4. Augustine. Confessions, BookXII, paragraphs “These things then being heard and perceived” through “But when he saith,” inclusive. E.B. Pusey translation, Gutenberg3296.

Selected two-disputes/intention context actually read. Theological premises retained; no Latin collation or complete-book examination claimed.

Tags

reading, text, silence, interpretation, author, reader, intention, context, hypothesis, inference, grounds, uncertainty, Aristotle, Locke, Hume, Augustine, Confessions, language, complex concepts, custom, causality, analogy, genre, utterance, quotation, retelling, absence, alternatives, responsibility, reader autonomy

About the authors

Andrey Zarinsh is the author and founder of United Wisdom. He explores inner transformation, the unity of traditions, intercultural dialogue, and contemporary spiritual discipline. Instagram: @andrey.zarinsh.

Maria Evilkut is a co-author of United Wisdom. Alongside her research, she seeks to test these ideas in practice and observe how principles of unity and mutual understanding work in real life between people and cultures. Instagram: @ilkutki.