

UNITED WISDOM

Self-compassion: preserving responsibility without self-punishment

Human Nature and Inner World

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

I30 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Self-compassion: preserving responsibility without self-punishment

Epigraph

“had compassion” — Luke 15:20, King James Version. The Russian edition gives an original editorial translation of this fragment; its religious context remains explicit.

What this article is about

After a harsh conversation, a person sometimes finds themselves alone with two tasks at once. They need to understand what they did and how to correct it. At the same time, they need to bear their own shame, exhaustion, or fear. When these tasks merge, punishing themselves can seem the only honest response. If I stop suffering, that must mean I have decided nothing substantial happened. Yet the duration of suffering and the completeness of repair measure different things.

Here, self-compassion means an attentive, nonhumiliating attitude toward a person experiencing difficulty, including difficulty following their own mistaken action. It supplies no certificate of innocence. We will distinguish support, justification, acknowledgment of consequences, and practical responsibility. Ordinary scenes are hypothetical examples, not stories about research participants. Scientific findings, a Christian parable, and Buddhist instruction retain their own boundaries: they can be compared around the question of returning to action, but cannot be declared one teaching or evidence for one another.

I. Two truths after one conversation

Imagine a hypothetical scene. In the evening, a father irritably cuts off his child, who has asked several times for help with a problem. Later, he remembers the frightened face and feels ashamed. His exhaustion belongs to the explanation of the circumstances. The child's unpleasant or frightening experience belongs to the consequences. The first fact does not erase the second. But the second does not turn the adult into someone whom it is now permissible to humiliate indefinitely.

First, it helps to name both truths in ordinary words. I spoke harshly. I was at the limit of my energy. This description leaves room for examination: what words were spoken, what the child wanted, what is needed now, how the evening is organized. A global statement about being a bad parent closes these questions with one verdict. It may sound more serious, but contains less information that can be used for repair.

Support does not begin with the conviction that the action was trivial. Sometimes it really was serious. Support means refraining from adding arbitrary humiliation to the existing pain. A person can sit down, drink water, recover the capacity to listen, and then return to the conversation. These actions do not pay for the harm caused. They merely create conditions in which the person can speak more accurately and defend themselves less.

This distinction has an observable consequence. If, after a pause, the person acknowledges what they said more clearly and begins correcting the situation, the pause helps responsibility. If they use it never to return to the question again, the task remains unfinished. We need not assign one gesture a fixed moral meaning in advance. We need to see what it becomes in a particular sequence of actions.

II. What research allows us to say about motivation

In Juliana Breines and Serena Chen's 2012 study, experimental conditions involving self-compassion were compared with other conditions. In one experiment, after recalling a transgression, participants reported greater motivation to make amends and avoid repetition. Another measured study time after an initial unsuccessful attempt at a difficult task; the difference in subsequent test results was not significant. These findings concern particular conditions, motivation, and behavior in a laboratory task, rather than a guarantee of lasting moral change. [S1]

For our question, what matters is that support and the desire to improve need not contradict each other. This does not establish a rule that every person who speaks kindly to themselves will necessarily behave better. Promising such inevitability would itself provide an escape from checking: say the right phrase, and everything else seems assured. In life, separate actions, agreements, and consequences remain.

We do not transfer the name of a research condition to every pleasant thought. Phrases that reduce discomfort differ. One helps bear a fact: I caused pain and can acknowledge it. Another excludes the fact: because I was exhausted, nobody has a right to be upset. A third postpones the question: we will see later. Similarity of tone says nothing about their relationship to reality.

The practice below is an editorial way to organize an ordinary episode, rather than a reproduction of the experimental procedure or a method with demonstrated clinical efficacy. Its outcome is judged modestly: has it become clearer what harm needs acknowledgment, what step is available, and what remains unknown? A pleasant inner feeling may accompany that clarity, but does not serve as its only measure.

III. Self-punishment is not a receipt for compensation

After a mistake, a person may spend hours mentally replaying the scene. Sometimes this helps them notice a detail they missed. But repetition can easily acquire another function: I present my suffering to myself as proof that I take what happened seriously. A strange internal accounting then emerges. The worse I feel, the more seems to have been done toward repair, although the other person has received neither an explanation nor help.

Examination can be distinguished from punishment by what the next round contains. Has new information appeared? Has the task become more precise? Is it clearer whom to contact? If every round merely intensifies the same verdict, intensity increases without a new subject for work. This observation does not prohibit strong feelings. It allows us to refrain from assigning them a role they do not perform.

In the hypothetical story about the child, inner accusation will not replace a brief acknowledgment: I spoke harshly to you; speaking that way was wrong. It will not replace asking whether help with the problem is needed now. Nor will it replace changes for the next evening, when the adult needs to state a rest period beforehand or ask another adult to participate. Each action has its own recipient and time.

Compassion permits abandoning unnecessary punishment while preserving the cost of repair. That cost can be unpleasant: acknowledging a mistake publicly, spending time redoing something, returning another person's property, accepting reduced trust. A supportive tone does not promise that responsibility will be easy. It helps keep its difficulty from becoming an additional argument that a person must be denied water, sleep, or an opportunity to think.

IV. Returning in the parable does not erase the action

In the parable of two sons in the fifteenth chapter of Luke, the younger son returns after losing his property and acknowledges wrongdoing; his father receives him with mercy. The older son expresses resentment concerning his work and position. This religious account preserves return, acknowledgment, and tension within the family together. We use it neither as an experiment on self-compassion nor as universal instructions to an injured person. [S2]

The limited comparison concerns returning to a conversation without first obtaining proof of one's faultlessness. In many ordinary situations, a person waits for something impossible: first become someone who would never have done this, and only then confess. But acknowledgment is spoken by the very person who acted wrongly. Otherwise, responsible action would continually be postponed until the reason for it disappeared.

The image of mercy must not become a demand that a particular person forgive us. They have their own feelings, requirements for safety, and right to distance. If they are unwilling to talk,

our compassion toward ourselves creates no access to them. The possibility of continuing to live with an acknowledged fact and the absence of guaranteed reconciliation can coexist. Support is also needed to bear that limit.

Nor should real people automatically be assigned the parable's roles: one becomes the prodigal son, another the generous father, a third the envious brother. Such a scheme can silently assign moral judgments before circumstances are examined. Better to leave the religious text within its own world and take only a clearly stated comparison for our question: returning to action is possible after acknowledgment, rather than exclusively after a perfect past.

The comparison has another boundary: a person need not adopt the religious picture to examine their own episode. A reader from another tradition can recognize the question and retain their own grounds. A shared practical question does not establish a shared faith. Dialogue benefits more from naming the level of comparison honestly than from turning another tradition's text into convenient decoration for one's own thought. Here, the comparison concerns the possibility of returning, rather than teachings about sin, salvation, or human nature. A full account of those would require another investigation.

V. Caring for oneself and another involves different tasks

In the Sedaka Sutta, SN 47.19, the account of acrobats is connected with mindfulness practice and mutual protection. Care for oneself is described through developing practice; care for others through patience, nonharming, goodwill, and sympathy. This is Buddhist instruction, rather than a contemporary self-compassion scale. The comparison concerns discipline that supports relationships while retaining the different tasks belonging to each person. [S3]

In the ordinary scene, the adult is responsible for how he manages his exhaustion. The child must not become his comforter after being shouted at. It is possible to say the day was difficult, but not to assign the child the task of proving that the father is good so the adult can finally feel relief. Supporting oneself is especially needed where we might otherwise demand emotional payment from someone we have already hurt.

The same distinction applies between colleagues. Someone who wrote harshly in a shared discussion can prepare for a conversation with a trusted person. But the conversation with the recipient must remain about the words used and the work issue. A lengthy account of one's own torment sometimes shifts attention to the writer and obliges everyone else to comfort them. A strong experience does not mean every setting is suitable for its full expression.

Care for oneself need not happen alone. We can seek support from someone who is not responsible for resolving the conflict and state the request beforehand: help me see my actions and next step calmly. This differs from seeking a judge who will immediately declare

the other person wrong. Good support preserves the possibility of hearing an unpleasant specific detail and does not require confirmation of a convenient account.

When choosing a listener, consider the other participant's privacy too. Help can be obtained without sharing an entire correspondence, personal information, and painful details. Sometimes describing one's own action and task is enough. If context is needed for understanding, it should be limited to the conversation's purpose. Caring for oneself grants no automatic right to make another person's life material for any number of discussions. This care preserves both parties' dignity and reduces the new consequences that would also require examination later.

VI. Kindness must withstand an accurate description

It helps to check a supportive phrase for compatibility with facts. Saying everyone sometimes makes mistakes may be true, but remains too general. What exactly did this person do? Who encountered the consequences? What was promised? Adding detail does not destroy kindness. It shows whether kindness concerns a real person in a real episode or only a convenient image from which unpleasant details have been removed.

For example, an employee sent a document without a necessary check, and a colleague spent the evening correcting it. We can recognize the employee's exhaustion and also name the colleague's lost evening. We cannot decide in advance that the loss was insignificant because the author is already suffering intensely. Their inner state tells us about their state; it does not automatically determine the price for another person. Sometimes that price must be asked about separately or established from circumstances.

Accuracy is needed in the other direction too. If another person's feelings are unknown, presumed pain must not be recorded as established. Self-compassion allows uncertainty to be borne without convenient justification or an invented maximum accusation. We can say: I understand that I created additional work; I do not know all its consequences and am ready to hear them. This is calmer than declaring oneself the destroyer of everything, and more informative.

With this approach, a mistake need not be diminished for a person to retain dignity. Dignity is not a reward for the absence of bad actions. At the same time, preserved dignity does not cancel evaluation of the action and necessary restrictions. These levels need to remain together, especially when the cost of a mistake is high. Otherwise, every serious conversation will swing between total humiliation and a premature declaration that nothing substantial happened.

Accurate acknowledgment is usually shorter than an explanation of one's entire inner world. But brevity need not become coldness. We can listen to the response, clarify what is unclear,

and refrain from immediately disputing every unpleasant expression. If the response contains a statement we disagree with, that can be examined separately while preserving acknowledgment of the known part. Responsibility does not require accepting every accusation in full. It requires not using the disputed part as a convenient reason to reject everything, including one's own verified actions and their evident consequences.

VII. A promise to improve needs an available action

After shame, it is easy to give an excessively broad promise: never be irritated again, always be attentive, completely change one's character. It seems proportionate to the experience, but is difficult to check and fulfill. A person does not control the appearance of every feeling. They can sometimes decide beforehand what to do at a familiar signal: stop writing a message, request five minutes, check a document, warn of a delay. These are editorial examples, rather than guaranteed means of change.

The next step should address an observable consequence. If an incorrect amount was sent, the first need is the corrected amount and a message to the recipient. If a conversation was humiliating, a conversation about the manner of address is needed, rather than just extra household help. A pleasant gesture can have value, but does not always concern the damage that occurred. Compassion does not remove the need to match problem and action.

Not every step is available immediately. The other person may be absent, refuse contact, or request a pause. We can then prepare an accurate acknowledgment, finish the revision, retain funds for repayment, and avoid violating the boundary by expecting an immediate response. Preparation remains preparation. Repair must not be declared complete just because a good intention has been formulated internally or a message written that nobody has read.

For a recurring situation, a small change in conditions is more useful than an endlessly solemn promise. In the evening story, the adult can state in advance when help is available and agree on what happens before then. But that arrangement is discussed with those affected; one's own routine cannot simply be presented as everyone else's obligation. Responsibility includes coordination, and supporting oneself helps bear its ordinary, unheroic work.

Checking an agreement needs a reasonable timeframe. If it concerns the next evening, it can be revisited tomorrow. If a working procedure changes, looking at several real cases can help. Constant supervision of every internal movement is unnecessary. Choose an observable sign: help started at the agreed time, the correction reached its recipient, the mandatory check was actually performed. When that sign is absent, examine the reason and a new solution. Support thus helps learning from an outcome, rather than merely maintaining a favorable account of one's intentions.

VIII. When supportive words become a way to disappear

There is a substantial counterexample: a person acknowledges difficulty, explains their behavior through their experiences, and then considers the matter closed. In that case, a gentle tone does not indicate responsibility. The problem is not acknowledging difficulty itself, but the vanished recipient and unexamined consequence. If a close person is still awaiting repayment or completion of an agreement, a new inner attitude does not make the waiting less real.

We can ask which part of the situation appears in our explanation and which disappears. Is the specific action present? Is the other person present as a separate participant with their own needs? Is there an available action or an honestly named reason why it remains impossible? These questions are not a moral examination for obtaining a right to support. They check the explanation's completeness and the next step's direction.

Sometimes a person really cannot do everything necessary now. Responsibility can then begin by communicating the limits of capacity and seeking a feasible solution. Naming a partial repayment and a time for the next discussion is better than promising the impossible through fear of appearing bad. Yet real limits cannot automatically be treated as sufficient grounds to place the entire cost on another person. Conditions need discussion, and the other party's agreement cannot be invented for them.

There is no mandatory formula that works equally for lateness, serious harm, and prolonged conflict. The more substantial the consequences, the less reason there is to replace specific examination with general words. Compassion can accompany acknowledgment of external rules, professional help, and restrictions on contact. It does not cancel them or give this article's author authority to decide which consequences a person must accept in somebody else's situation.

IX. Responsibility can continue without constant emotional intensity

After several days, emotional intensity often changes. A person may become afraid of relief: if I no longer hurt so much, I must have forgotten something important. Yet the task can be remembered differently. A corrected document, agreed deadline, new evening conversation rule, or repayment reminder preserves responsibility's subject without the need to relive maximum shame every hour. This is no proof of innocence, but another way to preserve the work.

The opposite demand is unnecessary too: now that a step has been taken, feelings must disappear. They can linger or return in a similar situation. Support includes refraining from a

new accusation over the absence of quick relief. We evaluate whether a specific action was performed, rather than whether a person managed to adjust their inner state immediately. A changed tone toward oneself does not turn feelings into an obedient indicator of success.

Sometimes damage remains after repair that cannot be fully restored. Self-punishment is then especially tempting because it promises endless continued payment. But acknowledgment of irreversibility must be distinguished from creating new pain. We can retain memory, maintain necessary obligations, and accept limits on trust. We cannot honestly declare that our prolonged suffering restored what was lost. Such accuracy is difficult, but does not require humiliation.

Self-compassion here sounds less like a triumphant victory than permission to continue ordinary life with unfinished complexity, without erasing it or making it the person's only content. Work, care, rest, and new relationships do not necessarily betray the past. But they do not establish that all questions about the past are resolved either. Preserving both boundaries can matter more than a beautiful feeling of completion.

Sometimes people around us associate the seriousness of remorse with its outward expressiveness. Calm speech then seems insufficient to them. A person can still acknowledge the fact clearly and explain the actions chosen without staging a performance of suffering. Yet they cannot demand that such a response immediately satisfy another person. A distance remains between honest action and somebody else's judgment. Self-compassion helps bear it without artificially intensifying experience or prematurely concluding that the dissenting listener simply fails to understand the correct form of responsibility.

X. The measure of support belongs to a particular situation

Some people can use warm inner language; others find it foreign or excessively persuasive. There is no need to begin with a phrase that is impossible to believe. An accurate, noninsulting description can suffice: this is difficult now, I did this, and I need this step. The tone may remain restrained. An absence of tenderness does not mean an absence of respect if speech preserves facts, possibilities, and human dignity.

A supportive action need not be large either. Sometimes it means finishing lunch before a difficult conversation, interrupting mutual accusations for ten minutes, or requesting help with wording. What matters is preserving the connection to the next action rather than declaring the gesture itself the situation's completion. If longer rest is needed, a time for returning to the question can be stated directly, or a circumstance under which that time will be reconsidered.

A useful outcome is a clearer map of the episode, rather than a definitive personal characterization. The action is named. Known consequences are separated from assumptions. The other person retains freedom to respond. An available step is defined. Limited capacity is

stated honestly. Support need not make someone happy to have meaning. It is enough if it helps them remain close to reality without demanding that either party immediately remove all complexity.

Every new situation nevertheless requires fresh examination. A successful conversation yesterday does not guarantee correct action today. Yesterday's mistake does not establish tomorrow's inevitability either. Compassion supports returning to distinctions when emotions push toward a ready verdict or convenient justification. Responsibility remains work over time: see, name, agree, act, and check what actually happened.

What this means in practice

Take one recent episode of moderate difficulty that can be examined calmly. Do not begin with the most painful event. Record the observable action and your state separately. For example: I interrupted the listener several times; I felt rushed and irritated. Do not derive a verdict about your entire character from two lines. If the precise words are not remembered, state that while retaining what is known.

Next, name the consequence that is known and the consequence that can only be supposed. Do not answer for another person's feelings. Note one question suitable to ask if contact is available and wanted by the other party. Then write support compatible with the fact: acknowledging this is unpleasant, but I can speak without insulting myself. A more restrained phrase is possible if warmth does not fit right now.

Choose an action connected with the consequence: correct a record, acknowledge interrupting, return an object, clarify an agreement. State the time and conditions. If the action depends on another person, preserve their right to refuse or request a pause. A prepared message, a sent message, and a conversation that occurred are different outcomes. Record the one actually reached without upgrading its status because of a good intention.

After acting, reread the record. What is done? What remains? What new information appeared? Do not check whether you have become permanently kind and calm. Check the specific step and completeness of the picture. If the record becomes another trial without new information, close it at the honest current outcome. Return upon a new fact or agreed time, rather than solely upon another surge of accusation.

Key quotation

“he was lost, and is found” — Luke 15:24, KJV. The Russian edition supplies an original editorial translation. The article compares return with the possibility of acting after acknowledgment; religious mercy is not turned into another person's obligation to forgive us.

Connections between traditions

I25 “The inner critic” — moving from verdict to an observable episode. I26 “Perfectionism” — completion conditions and the cost of demanding faultlessness. I-13-N02 “Kindness toward oneself and keeping a promise” — connecting support with a specific agreement. I23 “Projection” — the boundary between a known consequence and an explanation of another person's inner world. References identify catalog topics, rather than already published materials.

Sources

S1. Breines, J. G.; Chen, S. Self-Compassion Increases Self-Improvement Motivation. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin 38(9), 2012, 1133–1143. DOI 10.1177/0146167212445599. Author-hosted PDF. The abstract, selected methods and results of Experiments 2/3, and a discussion limitation were read; full-paper reading is not claimed. Motivation and study time differ from established long-term repair of harm. Juliana Breines and Serena Chen authored the experimental psychology paper; current positions were not established.

S2. Luke 15:11–32, King James Version. Passage text. The entire specified parable was read. The Russian edition translates two brief fragments editorially; the theological narrative is not used as empirical confirmation. This is a Christian canonical text; traditional attribution to Luke is not presented as an established modern biography. The host labels the edition Public Domain; universal territorial rights were not established.

S3. Sedaka Sutta, SN 47.19, translated by Thanissaro Bhikkhu, Access to Insight, revision 30 November 2013. Primary text in translation. The whole short text and rights notice were read. The translator is a Buddhist monk and translator of Pali texts. The page states CC BY-NC 4.0; commercial permission was not inferred from open access. A brief attributed paraphrase is used without reproducing the translation; the full doctrine of mindfulness is not transferred to the ordinary exercise.

Tags

self-compassion, responsibility, self-punishment, acknowledging mistakes, repair, shame, dignity, support, consequences, boundaries, reconciliation, mercy, mindfulness, Buddhism, Christianity, Breines, Chen, Gospel of Luke, Sedaka Sutta, Thanissaro Bhikkhu, promise, agreement, parenting, communication, accuracy, practice, inner speech, United Wisdom

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 coauthor of United Wisdom. Alongside 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.