

UNITED WISDOM

The Person and the Inner World: Where Self-Knowledge Begins

The Person and the Inner World

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

I01 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

The Person and the Inner World: Where Self-Knowledge Begins

Epigraph

> *“we are dealing with a fluctuating material”*

William James, The Principles of Psychology, Vol. I, Chapter X: an exact internal clause of the sentence beginning We see then, in the English original. The carrier read reproduces the Henry Holt title edition of 1918. The passage concerns the shifting boundary between me and mine.

What this article is about

After an ordinary conversation, someone might say: “I became flustered”, “I find it hard to disagree”, or “I am weak”. These statements concern different things: experience at a particular moment, a proposed pattern of behaviour, and an overall judgment of the person. Self-knowledge begins by distinguishing those transitions. Here the inner world means feelings, thoughts, memories, intentions and ways of describing oneself, rather than a separate place containing a final answer about a person. We will compare selected primary philosophical and psychological texts with hypothetical everyday scenes. James questions the boundaries of a self-image; Hume asks what inward observation supplies; Montaigne explores a changing self-portrait; Epictetus distinguishes a situation from judgments about it. Their arguments remain different. This introductory map offers more precise questions: what did I notice, what did I infer, which standard did I use, and what still needs checking?

I. Experience and a conclusion about oneself have different scales

Imagine someone who does not immediately answer a question at a work meeting. They remember a pause, warmth in their face, and the thought that everyone is waiting. This describes a particular episode. “I always get flustered” already joins several cases, while “I cannot work with people” extends the conclusion to a much wider area. These transitions may prove justified or mistaken; vivid experience and confidence in the account do not decide the matter by themselves. A useful beginning is to notice when the object of the statement changes. Naming what happened, proposing a lasting characteristic, and assigning oneself a place on an overall scale are different undertakings.

In such an examination, preserve the scene that a label has too quickly replaced. What question was asked? Was it understandable? Did the person remain silent throughout, or answer later? Could they perform the task away from the meeting? If the question required clarification of the available information, the pause acquires a different meaning. If they repeatedly avoided a question they understood, a different issue emerges. Precision does not promise a comforting outcome: details sometimes reveal a genuine difficulty. They do, however, give us something to discuss and change. A broad statement of incapacity leaves it unclear what should be checked or how to explain the need that arose.

The inward experience remains significant. The person may indeed have felt fear or embarrassment even if nobody noticed the pause. A feeling and a conclusion simply perform different tasks. The feeling describes how the situation was experienced; the conclusion relates it to a proposed order of things. This introductory map does not require us to choose between them. We can acknowledge an experience while leaving its explanation open: “I found it difficult to answer. I do not yet know whether that concerned the unexpected question, my relationship to the audience, or insufficient preparation.” The statement preserves both the difficulty and the possibility of identifying its conditions.

II. Me and mine are not always separated by one line

James begins Chapter X with the empirical self in a broad sense: what someone is inclined to call themselves and their own. His observation about the shifting boundary between these expressions is particularly useful here. Work, reputation or a familiar place can enter the experienced image of a person. This is a historical description of a way of relating to oneself, rather than an instruction to regard other people as property. It invites a particular question: which part of a self-image was touched by an event? A disagreement sometimes concerns one object but is experienced as though the whole person has been rejected.

Suppose a craftsperson shows a shelf they recently made. A visitor remarks that the fixing looks inconvenient. The maker might hear a technical suggestion, doubt about their competence, or a refusal to respect their labour. These meanings are not equivalent. The shelf is connected to the maker’s work, but the particular comment still needs examining: which fixing, for what load, and under which conditions? Someone defending themselves against a presumed humiliation may miss a useful question about the object. Requiring them to endure an insult for the sake of a technical correction would be another confusion. The scene calls for separate consideration of the product’s quality and how people speak about it.

That boundary also matters when circumstances change. Losing a familiar position can mean losing income, a daily routine, a circle of colleagues, and a recognisable description of oneself. Reducing this to “just a title” would be inaccurate. Yet a list of losses is not an exhaustive account of the person. What disappeared, what remains, and what is still unknown are three

different questions. In Chapter 44 of the Enchiridion, Epictetus separates a person from the superiority of their possessions or eloquence. His ethical criterion differs from James's description, but their comparison exposes a useful distinction: belonging to my self-image does not make something the sole measure of my worth. Practical needs remain real and require their own response.

III. A social role reveals a relationship rather than the whole inner world

In one week, someone may be an attentive listener with a friend, a precise organiser of a shared trip, and a beginner in a class. Differences in speech and behaviour do not yet establish that one side is false. Other people's recognition matters in James's discussion of the social self; he distinguishes the images of a person held by different circles. For our map, this is a reason to identify the audience. "What am I like?" sometimes conceals another question: "How does this group know me, and what am I trying to maintain here?" The answer concerns a relationship within which the person acts.

Our hypothetical trip organiser might give brief reminders about departure time, although their friendly conversations are gentle and expansive. Brevity performs a coordination task. If they deliberately humiliate latecomers, however, a reference to the role no longer explains the whole action. We should ask whether humiliation was needed to convey information and what consequences it left. A role establishes certain duties and expectations but does not remove the possibility of discussing how they are carried out. Learning about oneself through roles therefore requires two descriptions: what was required of me, and how I actually handled it. The two can coincide, conflict, or reveal a choice that had gone unnoticed.

In Chapter 17, Epictetus uses the image of an actor performing an assigned part. His argument belongs to a different, normative and theological framework; it is not a contemporary requirement to accept any unfair assignment. Comparing him with James distinguishes a position, self-presentation, and the quality of an action. One can learn a new role without declaring an earlier identity destroyed. One can decline an obligation one never accepted, or discuss its terms. The inner world appears here through questions about promises, authority and treatment of others, alongside a sense of naturalness. The map becomes more precise when a role is named concretely and is not presented as the complete definition of a person.

IV. Feelings, wishes and decisions need separate words

“I feel like it” sometimes quietly becomes “I need it”, and then “I must do it”. Imagine an invitation to meet friends. Someone welcomes the invitation, is tired after a long day, and also does not want to seem indifferent. If they describe all this as “I want to go”, part of the situation disappears. “I do not want people” erases another part. We can name different relations to the same event: pleasure in company, a need for rest, concern about disappointing someone, and a decision still to be made. Such a list does not prescribe the correct choice, but makes its reasons visible.

An intention also differs from an action already performed. Someone may genuinely have planned to come and later communicate a changed decision. The other person can take into account the late notice that affected their shared arrangements, alongside that original intention. “I am caring” does not replace discussion of the consequence. Equally, one inconvenient refusal does not establish an absence of care. Preserve the particular sequence: what was promised, when a limitation became apparent, what was said, and which alternatives remained. Inward experience and the outward trace of behaviour complement one another here, although they are accessible to different participants.

Feelings do not have to form one tidy position. Joy and regret can concern different aspects of the same change. That is logically possible without a special theory of the mind’s hidden machinery. Moving home might remove a long commute while taking someone away from familiar neighbours. Naming both aspects clarifies the situation rather than exposing the earlier joy as false. Introductory self-observation can ask what each feeling concerns and which action the person is prepared to choose. Not every sensation needs to become an immediate act. A decision can consider promises, available energy, and information not yet obtained. Statements about feelings remain descriptions of experience rather than proof that there is only one reasonable way forward.

V. A self-image is an account that can be clarified

“I never finish anything” may rest on several conspicuous unfinished projects. But which undertakings count in the account? Someone may have done their everyday work for months, maintained contact with a loved one, and completed a course without considering these sufficiently significant. Examining the account does not require us to declare them successful in advance. It requires us to understand what a project means and why some cases enter the generalisation while others remain outside it. Without those questions, an argument between “I can do nothing” and “everything works out for you” merely changes the sign of a broad label while preserving its imprecision.

At the beginning of Of Repentance, Montaigne describes a changing subject and a self-portrait dependent on moments and circumstances. This is part of his literary inquiry, rather than a tested theory of memory. It supplies a question for our own accounts: when were they composed, and for which purpose? A note after a difficult conversation may differ from an account a week later. One is nearer the immediate reaction; the other includes new information. Neither temporal proximity nor the calmness of a later version guarantees accuracy. We can retain both and identify which statement changed, and why.

Small, examinable units of narrative help with this. Instead of “I ruined my relationships with everyone”, someone describes one conversation, their words, the reply, and what they do not know. They may discover a repeated pattern of action, but repetition should be shown through particular episodes. Even an accurate account remains selective: it does not contain a whole life and need not explain everything at once. A self-image supports orientation, yet can be corrected when significant details emerge. Correction does not necessarily establish earlier insincerity. The person may honestly have described what they understood then, and now honestly account for something previously unnoticed. Responsibility for what was said survives alongside the possibility of clarification.

VI. Inward observation does not immediately settle what the self is

When someone turns their attention inward, they may notice a thought, an image, a sensation, or a direction of interest. A further question arises: who notices all this? It differs from listing what was noticed. In the selected opening paragraphs of Hume’s personal-identity section, a search for an invariant impression of the self encounters particular perceptions. Discussing the inward side of the empirical self, James distinguishes concrete capacities from a deeper question about their unity. They construct different arguments. Both belong on our map precisely because the ordinary statement “I feel this” does not constitute a complete answer about a person’s nature.

Imagine a reader noticing irritation at a particular letter. “There is irritation in me” is one way of describing the experience. “My true self is peaceful, and the irritation is foreign to it” adds a position about what counts as the real person. That position can be examined, but cannot be presented as a simple observation. An opposite hasty transition is also possible: “Since I have not found an unchanging core, I do not exist at all.” Discussion of the letter does not require that conclusion. There are a sent message, a reply, relationships and consequences. Metaphysical debate makes none of these insignificant and does not release participants from addressing a particular action.

In the selected passage, James explicitly limits part of his description to his own case and leaves questions open. This exemplifies discipline in self-description: “I notice this” and “everyone is constituted this way” require different grounds. We need not repeat his historical bodily hypotheses as contemporary facts to appreciate that distinction. Introductory self-knowledge can arrive at a more modest result: the person distinguishes an observed state from the explanation added to it. They still lack a final theory of the unity of experience, but have a clearer question. That incompleteness allows conversation and inquiry to continue, without closing a complex issue through a convenient name.

VII. Memory connects an account without containing a whole life

Someone remembers themselves in a school classroom and recognises certain familiar reactions in their current work. Between the episodes may lie years about which they can say little. We cannot simply add vivid memories together and call their sum the whole person. In the selected paragraphs 18–20, Hume discusses memory in relation to resemblance and causal connections; he also notes that attributed identity extends to forgotten actions. This is his philosophical argument, rather than a contemporary experiment. The particular problem matters for our map: a connected account is not equivalent to everything its narrator can remember.

Suppose an adult explains present indecision through one school presentation. That episode may have mattered. Yet “everything began then” includes a causal claim requiring additional grounds. Were there earlier similar cases? Did behaviour change in familiar or comfortable circumstances? Which later events maintained the difficulty, and which contradicted the explanation? These questions concern the account rather than requiring rejection of a painful memory. Respect for someone’s story does not establish every conclusion it contains. We can acknowledge its significance to the person while leaving the supposed sole cause unconfirmed.

The reverse error is to consider a forgotten detail nonexistent or unimportant. Someone may not remember a particular promise, while the other person has kept a message. Memory is then one part of checking; the record and a conversation are others. We need not decide in advance who possesses the whole correct account. Identify what is supported, what diverges, and which parts remain unknown. Self-knowledge acquires temporal depth by distinguishing an event, memory of that event, and a present relationship to it. These layers connect, yet can change differently. A new understanding of the past does not rewrite an action already performed; it changes how someone responds to it now.

VIII. Self-evaluation depends on what counts as important

Two people make the same mistake reading an unfamiliar map. One experiences a small interruption; the other sees the collapse of their image as someone who always finds the way. We can understand this difference without measuring either person's overall worth. The second made a particular skill central to their self-description. James's discussion of selecting possible selves contrasts psychology, important to him, with his lack of Greek. He connects evaluation with an adopted claim. This is a historical conceptual illustration; it supplies neither a numerical formula for dignity nor a universal law governing every experience.

In our map-reading scene, we can ask where the requirement never to make mistakes came from. It may concern a professional duty, a family habit, or a wish to be useful. Different grounds lead to different responses. If a shared task depends on the route, the path needs checking, perhaps with another person's help. If only an impressive image was disturbed, a different conversation about what is being defended may help. Giving up an unjustified ideal does not remove a real obligation to resolve the route. Separating these questions preserves self-respect alongside the need to perform particular work.

Chapter 29 of Epictetus asks us to consider the conditions and consequences of a proposed undertaking. His normative counsel differs from James's description, yet both allow us to separate every possible life from one accepted task. An appealing imagined self cannot be realised alongside every other simply because it attracts us. Identify which choice has now been made and what it requires. On our map, an evaluation becomes clearer when its object, criterion and range of application are named. "I did not prepare sufficiently for this presentation" permits discussion of preparation. "I am an insufficient person" identifies no particular change and quietly makes each separate outcome a general measure of existence.

IX. Another person sees part of what is difficult to see from within

Someone may regard themselves as a good listener because they are sincerely interested in the speaker. A friend notices repeated interruptions. These statements need not contradict one another: one concerns interest, the other how a conversation proceeds. Discussing only intention loses the effect of interruption. Accepting only "you cannot listen" loses circumstances and possible exceptions. A precise conversation needs a scene: when a question was asked, who began speaking, where the other person stopped, and whether their thought could be resumed. The difference between inward motive and observable behaviour then becomes something both participants can clarify.

In the selected passage, Montaigne discusses friends' candid comments and the difficulty of their criteria. He neither simply rejects feedback nor grants it final authority. Chapter 45 of Epictetus distinguishes describing an action from adding a judgment without knowing its basis. These different texts encourage the question: what was noticed, and what was concluded from it? The contemporary application belongs to this article. It does not mean that every judgment must be postponed indefinitely, or that an unknown benevolent intention cancels visible harm.

Imagine a friend saying: "At yesterday's meeting, I did not finish a sentence three times because you began answering." The listener can ask which moments are meant and explain their attempt to understand the question more quickly. That explanation does not erase interruption, but allows discussion of a different way to express interest. Feedback becomes substantive when it does not demand an immediate general admission of being good or bad. A concrete agreement can be checked during the next ordinary conversation: let the other person finish, and then clarify what was heard. This is an arrangement between people rather than a proven method for changing personality. Both retain the right to say what worked and what has not yet changed.

X. Self-knowledge continues through relationships and actions

The inner world can be imagined as a closed room in which a person must understand everything before going out to meet others. That sequence overlooks questions that appear through action. Someone may consider themselves ready to collaborate and notice a difficulty only when shared work is divided. They may dread a conversation that becomes easier once its terms are clarified. Action then does not replace reflection; it supplies new material. Self-knowledge alternates between noticing, explaining, checking and responding, without requiring a final portrait to precede each next step.

A hypothetical group is preparing a small exhibition. One participant takes charge of organisation because they are accustomed to thinking of themselves as reliable. Later, they find they cannot keep up and avoid telling the others. Several things can be discussed: an actual schedule, the accepted workload, fear of disappointing people, and the previous image of reliability. An inward discovery cannot resolve all of them. The participant may need to pass on part of the task, correct a promise, and state a deadline. The response may be unglamorous, but connects understanding oneself with available action and those affected by delay. Participants receive usable information alongside an account of the organiser's feelings.

This introductory map therefore does not end with one word explaining a person forever. It maintains relationships between experience, self-image, social position, evaluative criteria and the trace of behaviour. No side exhausts the others. Sometimes the next step is to clarify a fact, hear another person, or reconsider an accepted obligation. The unknown can also be

named precisely without making it shameful or mysteriously profound. “I do not yet understand why I respond differently here” is enough to begin a particular inquiry, provided attention to circumstances continues. A person’s dignity does not depend on producing an exhaustive self-description; responsibility for available decisions still remains.

What this means in practice

For a small voluntary examination, choose an ordinary episode that does not require disclosure of another person’s secret: a meeting, a request, or a changed plan. Write two or three sentences about what happened without characterising yourself overall. For example: “I was asked to help on Saturday. I immediately agreed. In the evening I saw that another meeting had already been arranged.” If you cannot remember the exact sequence, say so instead of completing a confident story. The task is to obtain a sufficiently definite subject for discussion, rather than an account of your whole life.

Name the experience and the conclusion added to it separately. “I was afraid to refuse” differs from “I must always help”; both differ from “something is wrong with me”. Ask what the feeling concerns, where the rule came from, and what supports the broad conclusion. Some questions can remain unanswered. Seeing which transition requires missing information already clarifies the task. There is no need to replace every unpleasant thought with a favourable one: a more precise statement may include a genuine difficulty or limit.

Identify the role and particular promise. Were you answering a friend, a colleague, or someone sharing a task? What was actually accepted, and what merely presumed? Consider an outward trace that could supplement memory: a message, a schedule, or the outcome of an action. If needed, ask the other person to describe one moment, without requesting an overall character assessment. Their view can be considered alongside yours while distinguishing observation and explanation.

Finally, choose a manageable response concerning the episode: clarify a time, warn of conflicting plans, correct a promise, or ask the missing question. Do not promise to become a completely different person afterwards. Record what remains unknown and which circumstance would clarify it. This practice is offered as a way to organise questions; the primary texts establish no evidence of its effectiveness. You can stop, keep the note private, or not undertake it. Self-knowledge does not require public confession. It is enough to distinguish honestly what you experienced, what you assert, and what you are prepared to answer for in a particular relationship.

Key quotation

> *“A man's Social Self is the recognition which he gets from his mates.”*

William James, The Principles of Psychology, Vol. I, Chapter X, Social Self: the complete opening sentence before We are not only, in the English original on the carrier reproducing the 1918 edition. This describes one aspect of the empirical self; it neither exhausts the person nor measures dignity through others’ approval.

Connections between traditions

1. Shifting belonging and a measure of the person. James examines transitions between me and mine, including objects in an experienced self-image, at the opening of Chapter X. Epictetus separates a person from superior possessions or speech in Chapter 44. The connection clarifies attachment to an object versus assessing a person through it. Descriptive psychology and normative ethics remain different tasks; losses are not declared insignificant.

2. Social images and a performed part. James considers differing social selves among circles in Chapter X’s Social Self paragraphs. Epictetus uses an actor’s assigned role in Chapter 17. Both let us distinguish a person from a position and question the quality of action. James’s different audiences do not equal Epictetus’ theological assignment; this comparison does not require accepting an unjust obligation.

3. Observation and explaining unity. Hume searches for an impression of an invariant self and discusses particular perceptions in Treatise I.4.6 paragraphs 1–4. James distinguishes concrete inward capacities from questions about unity in the selected Spiritual Self passages. The connection concerns what an account of experience supplies and what a theory adds. These arguments differ; Hume’s later Appendix was not studied, and no contemporary scientific conclusion that persons do not exist follows.

4. Memory and a changing portrait. Hume distinguishes memory, resemblance and causation, including identity beyond recollection, in I.4.6 paragraphs 18–20. Montaigne describes a changing subject and circumstances of narration at the opening of III.2. Their comparison distinguishes a life’s temporal relations from an unchanging self-description. Philosophical identity and a literary portrait do not reduce to one memory theory.

5. An adopted standard and an undertaking’s conditions. James connects the significance of failure to an adopted self in Chapter X’s Rivalry and Conflict of the Different Selves. Epictetus asks us to review an undertaking’s conditions in Chapter 29. The connection specifies a claim and its costs rather than evaluating all possible lives at once. A historical success/pretensions illustration is not used as a measured law; ethical counsel does not become psychological proof.

6. A friend’s comment and the extent of inference. Montaigne receives feedback while scrutinising its measure in III.2’s Some of my friends and We, who live private lives paragraphs. Epictetus distinguishes description from assessment without understanding its grounds in Chapter 45. Both support asking what was observed and how the conclusion arose. The modern interruption scene is an editorial application; self-confidence does not become infallibility, and checking judgments does not cancel actual harm.

Primary sources

William James, The Principles of Psychology, Vol. I, Chapter X. English original. Title pages and preface of the Henry Holt 1918 carrier were read, followed by the chapter’s opening and selected discussion of the empirical self, feelings and pretensions. The remainder of the chapter and whole work are not claimed as read. Exact quotations: the internal We see then clause and the complete opening Social Self sentence.

David Hume, A Treatise of Human Nature I.4.6. English original with T/SBN locators. Paragraphs 1–7 and 15–23 were read completely; 8–14 and the later Appendix were not studied. Particular arguments concerning perceptions and memory are used without a final resolution of Hume’s whole philosophy.

Epictetus, Enchiridion. The displayed Elizabeth Carter English translation. Chapters 1–48 were actually read; the article uses 17, 29, 44 and 45. Closing chapters 49–53, the Discourses and Greek were not studied. Ancient prescriptions are considered within their own context.

Michel de Montaigne, Essays III.2, Of Repentance. Charles Cotton’s English translation edited by William Carew Hazlitt, 1877. The opening, discussions of external evaluation and private conduct, and the adjacent end of III.1 were read. The remainder of III.2 and French original were not studied. This is literary self-inquiry rather than a contemporary experiment.

Tags

self-knowledge, inner world, experience, self-image, self-description, James, Hume, Montaigne, Epictetus, empirical self, social self, roles, feelings, intention, action, memory, personal identity, self-narrative, feedback, observation, judgment, criterion, pretensions, circumstances, relationships, promises, responsibility, recognition, dignity, uncertainty, primary sources, philosophy

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.