

UNITED WISDOM

Why One Story Cannot Explain the Whole Person

The Person and the Inner World

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

I-19-N02 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Why One Story Cannot Explain the Whole Person

Epigraph

> *“pure types”.*

Carl Gustav Jung, Psychological Types, chapter X, section 11, p. 513, translated by H. Godwyn Baynes, 1923. A short fragment concerning typology.

What this article is about

Olga has grown accustomed to saying that she has always been someone who helps others. Real actions support this story: visits to relatives, assistance to friends, and extra work she took on. One day, however, she declines to join another shared undertaking and feels no wish to justify herself. A question now arises: was the earlier story false, or does this new refusal mean that Olga has stopped being herself?

Both versions turn one episode into an answer about the whole person too quickly. A story can preserve an important connection between events while leaving much outside it. This article considers how to use a personal narrative, a typological portrait, and the name of a role without requiring them to explain an entire life. A historical observation by Jung and a definition of narrative identity offer brief anchors; the subsequent discussion is our own. Every scene involving Olga is fictional. The article does not establish the reader's type, a concealed diagnosis, or one authentic biography. Its practical aim is a more precise scope for the story and the possibility of acting beyond it.

I. A story connects events without containing them all

In their author abstract for Narrative Identity, McAdams and McLean define narrative identity as an evolving life story connecting a reconstructed past with an imagined future. The research review's abstract was read here, rather than the whole article or all the studies it considers.

For our question, it helps to distinguish a narrative from a complete inventory of what happened. To make a story intelligible, a person selects events, arranges them, and highlights connections. They cannot simultaneously recount every encounter, all their activities, and every change of mood. This selection does not automatically make the story false. It makes it a particular form of presentation, with a subject and a limit.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

In Olga's fictional account, instances of helping become central. She may also have studied for her own interest, argued with people close to her, declined requests, and received care. These events do not necessarily contradict the chosen theme. They show that the theme is not the entire biography. The question of completeness arises when the narrative stops being one perspective and begins to require every action to conform to it.

It helps to ask why the story is being told now. At a meeting about a joint project, Olga explains why she knows how to organize assistance. In a personal conversation, she tries to understand why she is tired of extra demands. The same events can be selected differently for different questions. A change of emphasis need not mean pretence. It can mean that the subject under consideration has changed.

Yet a purpose does not authorize arbitrary changes to facts. If Olga promised to help and did not keep the promise, that part cannot be removed simply to preserve an image of reliability. A story allows a choice of details, but statements about particular events remain open to checking. The distinction between a perspective and a distortion becomes visible when an account reports something that never happened or conceals something material to the current agreement.

We can therefore keep two lines: this is how I currently connect these events; these are the events I rely on. Between them, room remains for a different order and a different conclusion. Olga need not abandon her story of helping in order to acknowledge a new refusal. She can clarify when helping was her choice, when it was an obligation, and what conditions made it possible. This account becomes more detailed in its basis, even if shorter in form.

II. A typological portrait is not the particular person

In Psychological Types, Jung explains that typological portraits emphasize shared characteristics while diminishing individual differences. This is a historical qualification of his descriptions, rather than an assessment of modern tests or a classification of the reader's personality.

A portrait helps us notice a pattern because it selects certain characteristics over others. For precisely that reason, however, it can make other characteristics less visible. When someone recognizes themselves in a description, it helps to ask where it fits and where it does not. Recognizing several sentences does not oblige them to accept the entire set of characteristics and predictions that someone attaches to the name.

In our fictional example, Olga is called a caring type. This may briefly convey that she often helps people she knows. The label says nothing definite about her attitude toward risk, work, silence, or learning. Nor does it establish how she will respond to a new request. Each such question requires relevant information, rather than an extension of a single label.

A typological frame becomes particularly restrictive when an exception is declared to be the person's defect. If Olga refuses, someone tells her that she has betrayed her nature. Description then stops following observation and begins directing behaviour. To preserve the portrait's usefulness, we should allow the person to move beyond it and check whether the description itself needs changing.

Historical typology, a contemporary questionnaire, and an ordinary role name need to be distinguished. They may use similar words while having different foundations and purposes. This article does not transfer the properties of one instrument to another. For example, a historical author's qualification of a portrait does not establish the accuracy or inaccuracy of a particular current test that has not been studied here.

If a label helps communication, it can be used with a stated scope: in this work, Olga often takes on organizational tasks. Such a sentence preserves observable content and allows change. It resembles a verdict less than an assertion about an eternal essence. A person can more easily clarify their availability in a new situation when an earlier description has not become an obligation to prove themselves again.

III. An exception can refine a story rather than destroy it

A story containing the absolute word “always” becomes fragile. A single mismatch can prompt a feeling of losing oneself or an attempt to deny the event. A more precise account allows for different conditions. It can describe a persistent habit without asserting that no other actions ever occurred. An exception then adds information instead of demanding a choice between complete fidelity and complete deception.

In a fictional scene, Olga declines to help an acquaintance move house. She has a trip planned that she spent a long time preparing. Refusal does not prove an absence of care. It shows the limit of her availability on a particular day. If she often postponed her own plans before, the new decision may change the practical arrangement. Understanding it, however, requires examining this choice and its circumstances, rather than immediately creating a new personality.

It may also turn out that the exception has occurred repeatedly. Olga recalls several earlier refusals that were absent from her favourite story. The statement “I always agree” now becomes less accurate. A question takes its place: why does she refuse calmly in some cases, while in others she feels obliged to accept the request? This difference opens a more specific area for examination.

An exception need not be more truthful than ordinary behaviour. Sometimes an unusual action arises from chance circumstances. Sometimes it expresses a new intention. Sometimes the person simply made a mistake. We cannot automatically regard an unfamiliar action as a

breakthrough to a true self. Its meaning requires the same checks as familiar episodes: what happened, what the person wanted, and what the consequences were.

It helps to preserve an event even if it does not yet fit a coherent account. Not every detail needs immediate explanation. Olga can write: I refused and did not feel the earlier anxiety; I do not yet know exactly why. This uncertainty does not cancel the fact. It allows her to return to the question later, when other information becomes available, without having to choose a final motive in advance.

Otherwise, the story starts requiring new hidden causes for every inconvenient case. Helping is care; refusing is also care; getting angry is secret care for a deeper outcome. The account remains outwardly unified, yet stops distinguishing anything. A more useful version allows that not all actions express one meaning, and identifies conditions under which its own formulation should change.

IV. A role depends on relationships and the situation's arrangement

One person can organize things among friends while preferring to follow someone else's plan at work. This need not imply a divided self or a mask. Tasks, knowledge, authority, and the wish to participate differ. An account of a role becomes more accurate when it includes these conditions, instead of turning noticeable behaviour into an essence independent of circumstances.

In our fictional example, Olga helps relatives because she lives nearby and knows the relevant addresses. On another project, she lacks the necessary experience and asks a colleague to organize the process. Looking only at the first circle of relationships makes it easy to call her someone who always takes responsibility for everyone. The second circle shows that this role did not arise everywhere.

A role can also persist through other people's expectations. They approach Olga first because she agreed before. She receives information earlier than others and therefore becomes the convenient organizer again. This sequence does not prove that she is the only capable participant. It shows an arrangement for assigning tasks that can be examined and, where necessary, changed.

Ability needs to be distinguished from willingness. Olga knows how to solve the problem, but does not want to take it on now. A skill does not create an indefinite obligation. Shared work may require a new response, the transfer of information, or another person to do it. The arrangement is what needs discussing, rather than the moral adequacy of someone who has stopped fitting a familiar description.

Changing a role may also take time. Others have grown accustomed to receiving help in a particular way and do not immediately know how to proceed differently. Olga can usefully state what is changing, what she will finish, and what information she will hand over. Such a transition differs from abruptly refusing to explain shared consequences. Yet a detailed personal story is not a mandatory condition of the new arrangement.

Change can be assessed by how actions are distributed. Have other responsible participants appeared? Are fewer requests automatically directed to one person? Is the response deadline clearer? This information shows how a role operates within relationships. It does not require deciding whether Olga is essentially a rescuer, an organizer, or someone who has finally discovered her opposite side.

V. A new understanding of the past does not change past facts

Today, someone may assess earlier actions differently. What they called freely chosen help now seems connected with a wish for approval. This is a possible present interpretation. We cannot automatically claim, however, that the person then already understood the same motive, or that all their care was pretence. Reinterpretation and establishing facts have different tasks.

In a fictional scene, Olga rereads old messages. They contain pleasure in the joint result, tiredness, and several requests that her contribution be acknowledged. A new narrative may highlight the wish for approval. That wish does not erase the pleasure or the work completed. It is more useful to recognize the event's mixed character than to replace one simple account with another that is equally comprehensive.

It also matters what is known from a record and what memory adds. Messages confirm particular words and dates. They do not preserve the whole inner life. Olga may remember a feeling, but should state her degree of confidence. If information conflicts, she need not quietly choose whatever makes the current story more persuasive. The contradiction can remain part of an honest description.

Other participants may remember the same scene differently. Their version does not become final merely because it is external. It can nevertheless clarify a circumstance that Olga missed. For example, help had been assigned in advance, whereas she remembered being the only person responsible. Checking restores the scale and helps avoid basing a later decision on an overly broad assumption about the past.

Separately, it helps to ask what the present assessment changes in action. If Olga wants to ask for appreciation directly, she need not first prove a hidden motive behind all her earlier actions. She can choose a new way of communicating on the basis of today's wish. The story provides

context, but the right to change a habit does not require an accusatory verdict on the entire past.

Reinterpretation need not end with a conclusion about who was to blame for the whole sequence. Sometimes it is enough to see that the shared arrangement no longer suits people. Participants may have acted in good faith and still need a new agreement. This account allows responsibility for specific breaches, if they occurred, without turning every change into an exposure of the former life.

VI. Another person need not accept your only version

A personal narrative can help explain a change, but does not give its author the right to define everyone in the story. Olga says that she has always rescued others. People she knows can acknowledge her help without agreeing that they were helpless. Their independent response does not prove that they are avoiding the truth. It shows that one story has different participants and perspectives.

In a fictional conversation, a friend recalls helping Olga in other situations. This is an inconvenient addition to her story, but she can preserve it. It does not cancel excessive demands in a particular undertaking. It limits the conclusion that assistance always moved in only one direction. Discussion of a specific division of tasks now becomes possible, instead of an argument about who was the true giver throughout the entire friendship.

When a story is used to support a request, it helps to separate the request from the biography. For example: I can no longer organize every meeting; let us take turns choosing the person responsible. The other person can respond to this proposal even if they do not share the explanation of past relationships. Agreement about an action does not require one psychological theory of all events.

Yet the right to another version does not mean a right to deny a confirmed fact. If Olga completed a task, her participation cannot be removed from the joint account for convenience. An event can be distinguished from its meaning for each person. Such precision helps acknowledge a contribution without an obligation to agree on an assessment of the whole person or relationship.

It helps not to demand immediate recognition of a new image. Olga may describe herself differently, while others need time to understand exactly what is changing. Clear communication of new conditions and maintaining them through action can be enough. Renaming a role without changing the arrangement can leave everything as before. Conversely, calmly updating agreements can change life without a major announcement of a new identity.

Nor does every recipient need to hear the whole story. A work question requires particular information; a close personal conversation requires different information. Olga can choose how much to disclose. This does not necessarily make her several accounts incompatible. Facts and limits material to shared action should not contradict each other, while disclosure of personal details remains her choice.

VII. Coherence does not replace checking the next step

A persuasive story easily becomes a prediction. If Olga has finally left an earlier role behind, it may seem that all subsequent decisions must express independence. Each new case, however, has its own circumstances. She can want to help without returning to the former arrangement. Freedom of choice does not require consistently doing the opposite.

In our fictional example, an acquaintance requests a small piece of help that Olga actually wants to provide. Refusing merely to confirm a new image would make her dependent on another narrative. A more precise question concerns the cost, desire, and conditions of this particular request. She can agree to a limited action and state in advance what it does not include.

Nor can the future be checked by how beautifully it concludes a story about the past. A new project may seem the logical continuation of a discovery while having unsuitable deadlines or demands. It helps to consider those conditions separately. Symbolic completeness does not guarantee feasibility, and a practical doubt does not necessarily mean fear of living authentically.

A small trial can be chosen where the task permits it. Olga hands over the organization of one meeting and then observes what happens. Perhaps the shared arrangement becomes more convenient. Perhaps it turns out that additional information is needed. The result provides specific evidence. It does not prove final freedom from a role or require rewriting the entire biography immediately to match one experience.

If the trial fails, the cause needs clarification. Another participant did not receive the address, the deadline was unclear, or the agreement had not been confirmed. These circumstances allow changes. A global story about being unable to let go of control could obscure a simple organizational question. First, it helps to examine what is actually known about the failure.

A sufficient action is sometimes possible without a trial stage. Olga knows that she no longer has time and directly declines a new task. She need not first convince herself of a new identity. A narrative can support understanding, but it is not a permit. A decision gains its grounds from current conditions, agreed obligations, and what the person is ready to do now.

VIII. An unexplained part can remain open

Not every episode needs immediate inclusion in an overall plot. A person can remember acting differently once while not yet understanding why. This need not be a gap that must urgently be closed. Preserved uncertainty makes it possible to notice new circumstances later. An invented connection might merely smooth the narrative at the expense of accuracy.

In a fictional scene, Olga is surprised that she calmly accepted help from someone she barely knew, although asking is usually difficult for her. The event and its conditions can be described: the request was specific, the help had an end date, and mutual debts were not discussed. This information does not guarantee an explanation. It gives grounds for a further question without requiring one participant to be declared the key to the whole person.

Sometimes a person prefers not to make an event part of self-examination at all. They remember it as a separate, fortunate encounter. This is an available choice. Life need not be wholly transformed into material for working on a personal narrative. Interest in one's story can coexist with activities, relationships, and experiences that do not require constant commentary.

An open question does not remove the need to answer a shared practical question. Olga may not know the motive for her refusal and still clearly state that she is not participating. She may not have completed a story about past demands and still agree on handing over a task. Distinguishing an inner explanation from an external response helps avoid waiting for complete clarity where others already need certainty.

It also helps to distinguish caution from evading facts. Leaving a motive unknown is one thing. Failing to examine a confirmed breach of a promise is another. In the first case, a limit of knowledge is preserved; in the second, responsibility may disappear. A story should not force a person to know more than they do, but neither should it provide a convenient way of overlooking what has already been established.

When new information appears, an open question can be reconsidered. The wording may change, or the same uncertainty may remain. What matters is that the account permits this transition. It does not require continuously finding one master key and defending it against every exception. A person can still speak about different areas of life in different, precise words, without declaring them parts of one finally deciphered scheme.

IX. A story becomes more useful when it remains a means

Another simple way to check a story's scope is to imagine a question it does not answer. Olga's narrative about helping can explain why she is invited to organize a meeting. It does not say what work she wants to learn in the coming year. If both questions receive the same answer, it is worth pausing. Perhaps a familiar theme has begun replacing information that belongs to another area. A new decision benefits from separate grounds: interest, available time, necessary skills, and learning conditions.

Olga can discuss a new job with someone who knows almost nothing about her relationships' history. In that conversation, describing a particular task may be more useful than spending a long time proving what she has always been like. This does not devalue the biography. It allows the explanation's scale to match the question's scale. Afterwards, she can return to the earlier account and see that it occupied only part of life. Another part has gained words of its own without a struggle for the right to be called central. Attention can expand while preserving what matters in the earlier story, without requiring it to explain every future interest, encounter, or refusal.

A personal narrative can give direction, preserve memory, and help explain a choice. Its limit appears when it begins defining permissible behaviour regardless of circumstances. The person then becomes occupied with proving their own description instead of examining the current situation. A freer account permits a refined scope, an exception, and a new response.

Let us return to Olga. She can preserve the value of helping and stop accepting every request. She can acknowledge a wish for appreciation without declaring her earlier care false. She can hand over a meeting's organization while freely offering participation in another case. These actions differ, but do not require choosing the only true Olga every time.

The result of reflection should be stated specifically: the earlier word “always” has become narrower; a clear limit for a new task has appeared; the story of helping now retains friends' contributions in return. This precision makes change checkable and does not promise a complete explanation of personality. A story serves its author when it helps them see life, including the part that does not yet fit their favourite plot.

What this means in practice

Choose one familiar statement about yourself. Find two episodes where it fits and one that requires qualification. Describe each episode's conditions without trying to establish a hidden motive immediately. Then replace an absolute word with a more precise scope: in these situations, under these conditions, during that period.

Separately, ask what decision now needs the story. If a new request is involved, check time, willingness, promises, and consequences. Do not require the decision to confirm an old or new role. It should answer a specific question and preserve other participants' autonomy.

Finally, leave room for the unknown and identify one available step. You can clarify a fact, update an agreement, or preserve an exception without explaining it. This practice does not establish a personality type or promise a therapeutic result. It helps use a story so that coherence does not become a prohibition against noticing new life.

Key quotation

> *“individual features”.*

Carl Gustav Jung, Psychological Types, chapter X, section 11, p. 513, H. Godwyn Baynes, 1923; a fragment of the warning that a typological portrait obscures individuality.

Connections between traditions

Comparison	Shared question	Material boundary
Jung's historical portrait ↔ a familiar role	What was left out of the description?	A role is not a typology
Narrative identity ↔ a decision today	How are events connected?	A definition does not establish a causal effect
A story of helping ↔ a mutual agreement	Who participates in the story?	Another person's version retains its independence

This is a limited map of historical psychology, a research concept, and our own reasoning; no unity of all schools is assumed.

Primary sources

• C. G. Jung, Psychological Types, chapter X, translation by H. Godwyn Baynes, 1923, York University Classics in the History of Psychology. Header information and selected paragraphs of section 11, pp. 513–514, were read; the whole book was not. Reuse rights here are UNKNOWN.

• Dan P. McAdams, Kate C. McLean, Narrative Identity, Current Directions in Psychological Science 22(3), 2013, DOI 10.1177/0963721413475622. The complete author abstract on the official APS website was read; the full research review was not. Reuse rights are UNKNOWN.

Tags

personal narrative, personality, Jung, typology, narrative identity, McAdams, McLean, role, helping, choice, exception, memory, interpretation, biography, facts, responsibility, agreement, boundaries, reciprocity, conditions, past, future, self-knowledge, uncertainty, revision, description, observation, practice

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 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.