

UNITED WISDOM

Memory, Expectation, and the Experience of Succession

World and Consciousness

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

W-12-N03 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Memory, Expectation, and the Experience of Succession

Epigraph

our consideration endures

Augustine, Confessions, XI.28.37; a complete clause from J. G. Pilkington's English translation in the New Advent / Kevin Knight revision. It concerns the attention through which an expected action becomes past in his account. This is philosophical inquiry within Christian confession, rather than an established brain mechanism.

What this article is about

While someone listens to a message, its first words have ended, its next words have not sounded, and meaning develops in the current activity. Memory and expectation help describe succession, but can be assigned excessive authority. A vivid recollection becomes a supposedly verified record; a clear plan becomes an already secured future. This article reads selected Augustine and William James passages to distinguish a lingering impression, later recollection, expectation, and performed action. Augustine's known-psalm example retains its theological surroundings; James's memory analysis remains historical psychology. Comparison establishes neither a common neural mechanism nor a treatment. Within UW's Path, the question is limited: what has happened, what is now recalled, and what is only anticipated? Distinguishing them may clarify a conversation and a next step. It promises neither perfect memory nor future control, and requires no reinterpretation of every life event.

I. Succession requires relationships

Imagine a voice message proposing a meeting, naming a time, and finally explaining that the offer depends on another participant's confirmation. The opening may sound like an arrangement already made. The final sentence changes the status of the entire message. Understanding requires more than distinguishing sounds: the relationship between parts and the completion condition matter. This is the article's own illustration, not a memory experiment. It raises a specific descriptive question: when did the proposal seem settled, and which unheard passage could still alter that interpretation? An answer depends on the message's content where it is actually available for examination.

The example does not require every listener to retain every detail equally well. A condition can be repeated or confirmed in writing. Another format may be needed because of noise,

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

language, hearing accessibility, or complexity itself. An instruction to live more attentively in the present resolves none of those circumstances. For shared work, the relevant question is what must be understood and how that can be checked accessibly. A meeting question may require only its time and confirmation condition. A small clarification need not become an inquiry into someone's character, relationship with the past, or capacity to imagine a future.

Connected succession does not mean later events were necessarily fixed by earlier ones. Before a message ends, the listener can anticipate its continuation, but that anticipation remains an assumption. The speaker can revise a phrase, receive information, or stop. Recalling the opening and expecting the ending belong to current understanding; neither proves that the event was predetermined. This boundary matters even in an ordinary conversation. Otherwise someone attributes an intention not yet expressed, then judges a change as violation of an allegedly completed promise. First establish which promise was actually made and which conditions belonged to it before drawing conclusions about its fulfilment.

Philosophical reading also needs these relationships. An isolated memory statement takes meaning from the author's question, surrounding example, and strength of conclusion. Mentioning expectation does not confirm an ability to see the future. A voice no longer sounding does not establish that the past never existed. The texts clarify subjects when their contexts survive the comparison. Our contemporary message remains an original application. Its usefulness is assessed by whether a particular arrangement becomes clearer, rather than by the authority of an author examining succession within a different historical and intellectual situation. The illustration does not acquire experimental support merely by appearing beside a source.

II. An ended voice and a remaining impression

In Confessions, XI.26–27, Augustine considers comparing sounded intervals and the difficulty of measuring what has ended. Sections XI.27.34–36 turn to voices and syllables: an ended sound no longer sounds, yet someone compares it with another. A remaining impression enters the explanation. The text is J. G. Pilkington's 1887 translation as revised for New Advent by Kevin Knight; the Latin was not checked here. The impression argument belongs to Augustine's philosophical inquiry into time. It is neither a current recollection-reliability study nor a measured account of the listener's nervous system.

Preserving the distinction needs no additional metaphysical conclusion. An ended voice and its current impression are different subjects. Examining the impression does not turn it into an external event still sounding. Equally, absent sound now does not cancel the fact that a message was spoken. Our imagined conversation therefore raises a smaller question: are we discussing its record, a current recollection of its content, or an impression it left? Those

subjects can be related while requiring different checks. They should not silently merge into a single infallible inner recording allegedly capable of resolving every dispute about the event, its wording, and its meaning.

Augustine also compares silence and voice through mentally rehearsing an interval in XI.27.36. This extends his inquiry into what is measured. The selected example supplies no contemporary formula for determining any event's objective duration from an inner impression. Neither an experiment nor a general accuracy test is reproduced here. Following the reasoning need not become an instruction to trust every internal estimate. When the imagined exchange concerns an agreed reply deadline, clocks and available records remain relevant. How waiting was experienced is another question, which one external timestamp cannot settle. Keeping both questions visible is more precise than assigning either description universal authority.

Within Path, the distinction permits examining the past without constantly repeating it. A specific message passage may matter because an action depends on it. Elsewhere the question is settled and returning adds nothing. A missing record may leave accuracy unresolved. That limit can be named without accusing oneself or another person of insufficient attention. A philosophical text does not guarantee recovery of a lost detail. It helps identify the evidence currently available and the conclusion being requested from it. Further inquiry also has a cost determined by the situation, rather than by an obligation to remember everything or reconstruct a complete personal history.

III. Expecting an action and having performed it

In XI.28.37–38, Augustine describes expectation, current consideration, and memory through reciting a known psalm. Before starting, the familiar sequence is expected; during performance, part becomes remembered while the remainder is still ahead. No psalm lyrics are quoted here. The example concerns action within his argument, not proof of an already fixed future. In XI.29, Christ's mediation and a heavenly calling belong to the surrounding Christian account. Removing that setting would misleadingly turn the author into a provider of a neutral contemporary planning technique or a psychological training exercise intended for all readers, neither of which this comparison establishes.

For our own illustration, consider a prepared message not yet sent. Its author knows the content, but the addressee has not received it. Sending and a possible reply can be expected without evidence that either occurred. Sending creates one fact; delivery or reading can create others if actually confirmed. Planning, performance, and response do not become one stage through strong anticipation. This is an ordinary distinction within our example, rather than a protocol derived from the psalm. It prevents another person's participation from being declared secured merely because one's own contribution is ready. Preparation deserves acknowledgment while its evidential limits remain clear.

A familiar sequence also has a boundary: knowing its words does not establish every condition of a future performance. Someone can stop, change pace, or encounter an external obstacle. Confidence about step order therefore cannot guarantee completion. In a life plan, this is especially clear where another person's consent, an available resource, or conditions for continuing are required. Those conditions must be established separately. Expectation can be substantive and useful without certifying an outcome. A revised plan need not betray an earlier intention: information, capabilities, or another participant's decision may have changed. That participant cannot be treated as a component within one's already finished script.

After one's action ends, the question remains what ended. An invitation was sent, but the meeting is unconfirmed. Instructions were read, but the operation was not performed. An attempt was made, but the result is unchecked. Such precision does not diminish effort. It locates the effort and clarifies what is actually required next. Augustine's expectation-memory distinction helps raise a question about the current stage. An answer belongs to the verifiable conditions of the contemporary situation. It cannot come from the philosophical analogy alone or be replaced by a confident future narrative others are asked to accept as an already completed shared decision.

IV. A recurring image is not yet recollection

In Chapter XVI of The Principles of Psychology, pp. 643–652, James distinguishes primary retention of the just-past from later recollection. He then argues that recurring content alone does not constitute memory. Its relationship to a past experienced as one's own matters in his analysis. This is historical psychology from 1890. Physiological conjectures and numerical characteristics are not adopted here as established contemporary results. The selected distinction asks about experience and concepts; it supplies no current test automatically confirming the truth of each remembered event. Describing how recollection is recognized and verifying what happened remain separate undertakings.

An original illustration is straightforward. A phrase from yesterday's message comes to mind again. That alone establishes neither its current origin nor whether the complete condition is reproduced correctly. The phrase might have been reread, repeated by someone, or accompanied by a new explanation. For the present task, ask which past event is being associated with it and what evidence is available. This need not cast doubt on every recollection. It limits one particular conclusion. If a detail affects a meeting or important handover, clarifying the condition may be more useful than arguing about whose inner impression feels stronger, clearer, or more convincing.

James's primary-retention distinction should not be translated directly into Augustine's vocabulary. Augustine examines measurement and action while addressing God. James analyzes experience and constructs a historical psychological classification. The chosen

passages permit comparison of the past's retained role in current understanding. This establishes neither a shared theory of the soul, an identical memory mechanism, nor demonstrated influence between the authors. A related question highlights differences rather than eliminating them. Accurate comparison preserves what each source attempts to explain and resists assigning either a convenient contemporary position. Their usefulness does not depend on making them speak with a single voice about every aspect of memory.

The practical boundary matters especially when something is forgotten. Not recalling a detail does not establish that an event never happened or lacked significance. Confident recall alone does not settle accuracy either. Here these limits concern evidence, without a general diagnostic assessment of memory. A present limit can be acknowledged and an accessible clarification selected. A missing record may leave the question open. This is no reason to force another person toward a prescribed inner state or demand acceptance of an account because it sounds confident, detailed, or emotionally powerful. Respecting the account and identifying what it establishes can happen together without resolving every uncertainty.

V. Dating, ownership, and present explanation

On pp. 649–652, James examines an image's relationship to a particular past and to its rememberer. Recognizing an event as one's own past matters to his analysis, rather than merely receiving similar content. The described sense of ownership does not become an independent guarantee of accuracy. Two questions therefore remain: what is experienced as recollection, and what is confirmed about the event? Both matter without being identical. Neither philosophical interest in memory nor respect for a participant's account requires the second question to be answered positively from the first alone. A meaningful description still needs appropriate grounds for any additional factual conclusion.

A message's date may help establish an arrangement's sequence. Did clarification precede or follow a proposal? Someone may have decided with only the original wording available. A later record can restore order if accessible and intelligible. Current knowledge should not be assigned retrospectively to that participant. What they could understand then differs from how the situation is explained now. This is the article's way of examining its illustration, rather than a method endorsed by James. It directs discussion toward specific information instead of a general accusation that someone should have known a later clarification in advance, before it existed within the exchange available to them.

An explanation can change too. Someone recalls a conversation and now links it to an outcome unknown at the time. That connection may be a useful hypothesis for current understanding, but it does not turn a future outcome into an earlier motive. Claims about intention need suitable grounds: an expressed decision, information then available, or a participant's clarification. No recovery of another person's entire inner world is promised. Sometimes

grounds remain insufficient. Respect includes declining to decide why someone acted when only message order and a present version of the account have been checked. A coherent later story is not automatically evidence of a coherent earlier plan.

A record has limits as well. It may confirm wording or a timestamp without supplying every experience, circumstance, and intention. The source does not establish universal superiority of external data over a personal account. It helps distinguish their functions. A precise condition may call for a record. A conversation's significance to someone may call for their current description, which they can clarify. If both subjects matter, they can be examined alongside one another without reducing everything to a single correct version. This remains a particular conversation, not a compulsory memory-checking ritual or a demand that every personal meaning be proved by an external document.

VI. Duration, order, and content

In James's Chapter XV, pp. 605–610, perceived succession is considered through lingering and prospective aspects of the present. Questions of duration and order are distinguished. The opening of p. 611 concerns symbolically conceived intervals. These passages identify several subjects: how long, which event came first, and what a sequence means. They establish no universal contemporary perceptual window. Their relevance here is descriptive. Someone may confidently assess one subject without sufficient information about another, even when both concern the same short message. Treating that confidence as a verdict on every related question would exceed what was actually described or checked.

For instance, waiting for a reply felt long. This matters as an account of the participant's experience, but does not establish when the recipient received the message, what was promised, or which conditions delayed a response. Those questions require additional information. Equally, a timestamp does not explain why the waiting mattered. The experience can be acknowledged while the arrangement is clarified, without selecting only one description. If someone declines discussion of an inner state, a work question may need only deadline and availability. If they wish to explain waiting's significance, a clock should not serve as a ready-made refutation of their account of experience.

Order sometimes matters without exact duration. A new address arrived and then a letter went to the old one; alternatively, the letter preceded the update. These situations raise different action questions despite possibly similar intervals. Minute-counting therefore cannot replace establishing succession. Succession alone does not establish motive either. An assessment needs clarity about which inference is supported. This is particularly useful when a technical detail quickly becomes a general judgment of someone. A record of order does not independently confirm carelessness, malicious intent, or an inevitably recurring pattern.

Further conclusions require their own grounds instead of borrowing certainty from a precise timestamp.

Within Path, choosing the subject can stop unnecessary inquiry. A deadline question may need only clarification of availability. A promise question calls for its condition. Waiting's significance may call for discussion with the participants' consent. Every layer need not be examined simultaneously. Sources explain differences without prescribing constant inner work. Sometimes the useful outcome is discovering that the required question is already answered; sometimes it is acknowledging absent confirmation. Both permit continuing without attaining a special relationship to time allegedly guaranteeing clear memory and correct expectation. A limited answer can be sufficient for a limited decision while leaving other questions genuinely open.

VII. Theology survives comparison

In XI.29, Augustine addresses Christian calling and Christ's mediation; XI.30–31 distinguish human temporality and divine knowledge. These belong to the read argument. Replacing them with mindfulness would falsely suggest unchanged content. The article requires no acceptance of a theological answer, but must acknowledge its presence. Comparison with James concerns limited descriptive roles of memory and expectation. It does not turn both works into one spiritual exercise or establish a contemporary UW proposal as continuation of either a religious recommendation or a psychological classification. Naming the difference preserves the source's actual explanatory purpose, including elements that a contemporary reader may not adopt.

This boundary does not make comparison useless. Augustine's question about action helps show why recollection, performance, and expectation should remain distinct. James's recurrence-recollection distinction adds another question. Both can become clearer without combining worldviews. Independent judgment does not require constructing a single metaphysics from every text encountered. It can identify which distinction helped with a particular case and which part of its explanation was not transferred. This leaves the source its own content and the reader the freedom to accept, discuss, or suspend a strong conclusion beyond the modern illustration. A limited comparison may be sufficient without claiming complete agreement between traditions.

The same limit applies to promises about the present. Current memory and expectation do not establish that recollection creates the external past or that intention controls the entire future. Those claims need separate grounds. The subject here is human description of succession and limited work with evidence. No transition is made to statistical entropy, quantum physics, or changing events through inward clarity alone. Available actions can depend on external conditions and another person. Acknowledging these is part of accurate contemporary inquiry

even if philosophical reading helped someone express their experience more clearly. Better language does not by itself supply missing resources, consent, or confirmation.

No obligatory relationship with one's past is prescribed either. Every event need not be reinterpreted and every expectation need not yield a lesson. A detail can be left alone if returning does not answer a current question. Where an important shared decision is involved, others retain a right to propose discussion conditions. An earlier agreement does not vanish because someone describes it differently today; a necessary change must be discussed where appropriate. Philosophical distinctions identify the subject without authorizing unilateral rewriting of an obligation or incorporation of another person's experience into one's preferred life story. Understanding a sequence remains different from owning everyone else's interpretation of it.

VIII. A next step without a completed script

Return to the voice invitation. Someone can distinguish what they heard, what they currently recall, and what they expect next. The open question is then named: is the meeting confirmed or proposed? A recording can settle the final sentence if available; otherwise a participant can be asked. Pending confirmation should not be entered as completed agreement. This is original UW application, not a universal communication protocol or a method with established efficacy. Its scope is a situation where distinguishing stages actually helps address a particular question. The proposal does not justify conducting this inquiry after every ordinary exchange or revisiting every already settled arrangement.

Clarification may change the next step. Instead of preparing for an agreed meeting, someone asks about its condition. Instead of rereading an entire exchange, they examine the relevant detail. Instead of accusing someone of delay, they establish the agreed deadline. These actions may be unavailable: another person may not answer, a record may be missing, or circumstances may prevent continuation now. The limit can then be named and a decision made with existing information, without treating uncertainty as a personal deficiency. Accuracy includes declining to present a choice under uncertainty as a fully confirmed resolution of all questions raised by the situation.

Where expectation concerns a priority, intention differs from a promise and an allocated resource. Someone may want to continue meaningful work without having time or assistance. The needed condition can be stated and the possibility of agreement checked. This is more specific than demanding stronger belief in a future. If the condition is unavailable, the activity's significance need not disappear, but action remains constrained. Both meaning and actual status deserve respect. Sources distinguish anticipated from performed; priority and agreement belong to the participants in their contemporary situation. They need not follow a

completed life script or treat a valued wish as evidence that the practical conditions already exist.

Experienced succession can therefore invite proportionate clarification. A remaining image reports current experience; recollection relates it to the past; expectation points toward what is not yet done. None must independently explain an entire event. Records, one's account, and another participant's clarification can be used according to the question, and inquiry can stop when answered. Within Path, the opportunity is to act with an honestly named stage and knowledge boundary. This is not possession of past and future, but an available choice under present conditions. Memory deserves attention while expectation retains the right to remain open, conditional, and subject to changes not controlled by one person alone.

What this means in practice

Select one current succession question: meeting confirmation, sending a message, or an expected reply. Leave aside subjects you do not want to consider now. This is an original UW proposal with no established memory benefit and no requirement to examine personal history.

Distinguish performed action, its current recollection, and the next anticipated step. Name each ground: observation, a record, a participant's words, or an assumption. Absent recollection does not prove an absent event; strong expectation should not be recorded as consent already received. Identify what is actually available to check.

Clarify what matters to the decision: order, duration, a promise's condition, or waiting's significance. Select a proportionate check of that subject alone. Others may decline discussing inner experience; an essential arrangement can be clarified accessibly. A record is not promised to recover all motives and circumstances.

Choose an available action: check wording, request confirmation, leave the question open, or revise your plan under the conditions. Stop when the answer suffices. If information is missing, state uncertainty. The proposal clarifies current status without demanding infallible memory, complete future control, or continuous self-observation.

Key quotation

> *No memory is involved*

William James, The Principles of Psychology, XVI, p. 649. A complete clause excerpt: the full sentence qualifies the denial as concerning mere recurrence of content. It neither denies memory's existence nor assesses a particular recollection's accuracy. The shortened extract retains its essential qualification in this explanation.

Connections between traditions

Texts and locators	Comparison mechanism	Boundary
Augustine, XI.27.34–36, voice and impression; James, XVI, pp. 646–647, primary memory and recollection	Distinguish lingering content from a later return to the past.	Augustine does not introduce James's taxonomy; no common neural mechanism is established.
Augustine, XI.28.37, expectation and consideration; James, XV, pp. 605–607, perceived succession	Examine relationships rather than isolated instants.	Descriptive resemblance proves neither shared ontology nor historical influence.
Augustine, XI.28.38, action before and during recitation; James, XVI, pp. 643–644, conceived past and future	Distinguish a known order from completed performance in the original example.	Expectation does not prove predetermination; contemporary message-sending is UW application.
Augustine, XI.27.35–36, retained impression; James, XVI, pp. 649–651, recurrence and relation to the past	Identify the past-event relationship asserted by a current image.	Neither passage supplies a contemporary testimony-accuracy test.
Augustine, XI.26.33 and XI.27.36, intervals and silence; James, XV, p. 610, duration and order	Separate duration, succession, and content questions.	Distinct accounts are not identical measurements; no common numerical rule follows.
Augustine, XI.29.39 and XI.31.41, calling and divine knowledge; James, XVI, pp. 651–652, recollection analysis	Preserve each text's explanatory task.	Christian eternity, historical psychology, and present UW choice do not become one practice.

Primary sources

1. Augustine, Confessions, XI, J. G. Pilkington translation, Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, First Series, Vol. 1; Philip Schaff editor, Buffalo, 1887; New Advent / Kevin Knight revision. XI.26–31, numbered paragraphs 33–41: intervals, voice, expectation, memory, and Christian context. Neither Latin nor the whole work is covered; theology does not replace contemporary memory research.

2. William James, The Principles of Psychology, XVI, original English, 1890; Christopher D. Green transcription, York University. Pages 643–652: opening, primary memory, and

recollection analysis. Historical physiological conjectures and numerical characteristics are not adopted as an established current mechanism.

3. William James, The Principles of Psychology, XV, the same edition and transcription. Pages 605–610 and opening p. 611: perceived succession and conceived intervals. The description supplies no universal contemporary perception limit and is not identical to Augustine's theology.

Tags

memory, expectation, succession, time, Augustine, Confessions, William James, primary memory, recollection, recurrence, impression, attention, past, future, present, voice, action, performance, intention, evidence, record, event order, duration, Path, conditions, agreement, knowledge limits, comparison of traditions

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.