

UNITED WISDOM

Odysseus: returning to oneself after a long journey

Human Nature and Inner World

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

I-20-N03 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Odysseus: returning to oneself after a long journey

Epigraph

> *Sure proofs.*

Homer, The Odyssey, XXIII, recognition after the account of the bed; Samuel Butler's translation, a short fragment of the narrator's speech. Edition.

What this article is about

Imagine a fictional scene. After several years working abroad, a person returns to the city where they once studied. They open the door of an old workshop and expect a familiar feeling: now it will become clear who they really are. But the table has moved, former colleagues are busy with other projects, and their own tools feel unexpectedly unfamiliar. Nothing catastrophic has happened. Returning to an address simply did not coincide with returning to an earlier state.

It is easy to recognize Odysseus's image in this experience. Yet the hero who reaches Ithaca still has to be recognized; his story meets the story of those who stayed home. In the selected Odyssey scene, concrete grounds for trust matter, alongside the strength of the wish to return. This article reads returning to oneself as a contemporary metaphor: an opportunity to relate memory, present actions, and relationships anew. We do not assume a hidden, unchanging core of personality or present the ancient plot as a psychological law. A more accessible question interests us: what allows someone to continue their life after a journey without requiring either themselves or others to restore everything that came before?

I. The address of return and the point of continuation

The expression returning to oneself can promise too much. Sometimes it means returning to a place, sometimes to a familiar occupation, sometimes to a relationship in which breathing felt easier. These wishes can coincide, but they can also diverge. Someone can live in their hometown again without wanting their former job. They can continue their profession elsewhere and feel connected to their history. It therefore helps first to name what exactly should return. Otherwise, an appealing expression combines several tasks that need different actions and different participants.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

UNITED WISDOM

In the fictional workshop, the person wants to regain the ability to work attentively and independently, rather than the position of the table. The former address seems the sole bearer of this quality because it first became available there. But a place and a way of working are not identical. We can ask what conditions supported the desired activity: time without urgent assignments, suitable tools, conversation with a colleague, permission to carry an idea through. This description does not create new conditions yet. It makes them worth seeking in current life, instead of judging the present solely through its resemblance to the past.

The opposite case also exists. Someone says they want independence back, but actually needs the presence of particular people most of all. Work arrangements cannot replace those relationships. Here, an accurate description does not reduce a wish to whatever is easier to achieve. It helps acknowledge which part is available, which requires another person's participation, and which may remain impossible. A metaphor of return should not promise that every important element of a history can be assembled again through one inner adjustment. Sometimes continuation includes acknowledging absence rather than achieving restoration.

We will use return in this limited sense: a person encounters again something they consider part of their life and explores what form of connection is possible now. This is an editorial proposal, not a definition of personality from a philosophical treatise or diagnostic manual. It allows different outcomes. An old occupation may resume; an important quality of it may appear in another activity; someone may realize a former wish is no longer theirs. No outcome proves a correct path before particular circumstances and consequences have been considered.

II. Recognition requires more than a strong feeling

In the selected Book XXIII of The Odyssey, translated by Samuel Butler, recognition is connected with the construction of the marital bed, about which Odysseus knows a significant detail. This is a literary scene with particular participants and an object, not a universal test of authentic identity. Its limited structure matters for our reading: wanting to believe and having grounds to believe differ. Penelope is not obliged to accept the returning person instantly just because those around her have already announced the reunion. Her doubt has a place in the narrative.

In contemporary life, grounds for recognition are often less ceremonial. A former colleague may remember a difficult shared project, but the memory does not yet say how working with them will be today. Someone may confidently identify a habit from their youth, but that does not guarantee it is still needed. It helps to connect memory with present observation. What has actually remained in the way of acting? What has changed? Which conversation can clarify it? A personal feeling of authenticity may be significant, but it does not automatically acquire authority to decide for other participants in a relationship.

This should not become advice to set hidden tests for loved ones. A test has its function in a literary plot; transferring it into everyday life can create humiliation or a trap. Instead of a concealed question whose correct answer only the questioner knows, we can state directly what remains unclear. Which obligations is a person actually ready to undertake after returning, for example, or which experience do they want to discuss? An answer is assessed through its substance and subsequent actions, not an ability to guess another person's inner scene. Trust does not require an examination in symbols.

A counterexample matters too. Sometimes recognition happens immediately and does not need prolonged checking; not every joy is carelessness. Our conclusion is narrower: recognition permits different tempos and different grounds. If doubt exists, it need not be declared proof of coldness. If certainty exists, it need not be destroyed in advance for the sake of a complicated procedure. We can ask what exactly participants are certain about and what remains open. The encounter then retains its emotional fullness without becoming a contract establishing that all subsequent expectations have already been agreed.

III. The person who waited lived through a journey too

The returning person easily becomes the story's center: they crossed borders, changed jobs, and handled difficulties not seen at home. Yet their absence created another history for those who stayed. Their time was not a paused room prepared for the arrival. They made decisions, changed habits, maintained relationships, and sometimes dealt with tasks previously shared. Return therefore involves an encounter between two lives that have continued. Not having the same experience establishes neither the journey's superiority nor waiting's superiority. Comparing suffering as grounds for a right to the final word usually does not help reveal current conditions.

In a fictional scene, someone returns to a family business and is surprised that important decisions are made without them. During the absence, their sister learned to organize work and made agreements with suppliers. The returner feels their place has been lost. The sister feels her acquired participation is becoming temporary again. If one is called Odysseus and the other merely the guardian of home, her story disappears. They can instead discuss each person's present responsibilities, necessary decisions, and available authority. A return does not erase abilities acquired while another participant was absent.

Recognizing someone else's history does not require giving up one's own place beforehand. There may be grounds for participation: an earlier agreement, necessary knowledge, an existing obligation. These grounds should be discussed specifically. What was promised before departure? Which conditions changed? What needs confirmation through a document or conversation? This article offers no legal solution for a family business. It simply

distinguishes an emotional wish to be recognized again from the operative conditions of working together. Both questions may matter, but one does not replace an answer to the other.

Sometimes this discussion reveals a disagreement that reunion does not remove. One person wants the old distribution restored, another wants the new one to continue. Refusal need not immediately be declared a betrayal of shared history. A new role, a jointly agreed trial period, or separate work may be available. Agreement may still be absent. The image of return helps raise a question about participation if it does not prescribe beforehand who must yield. A useful outcome may be modest: people understand what they disagree about and stop explaining it as a lack of love, gratitude, or depth in the journey's experience.

IV. A plot's hero gains no general entitlement to power

A literary hero may perform actions that cannot become everyday models. In Book XXIII, the reunion occurs after the killing of the suitors, and further consequences still concern Odysseus. Reading the return only as home's triumph removes this side. Our contemporary discussion of oneself does not require accepting the character's violence as a normative way to restore order. Attention to one episode does not imply approving every action within it. This boundary of literary comparison should be named before the metaphor becomes guidance for actual relationships.

In a fictional contemporary scene, a returning manager says that what they have endured entitles them to restructure everything without explanation. Experience may indeed bring knowledge that was absent before. But knowledge and authority differ. What task requires change, who is affected, and what decision procedure operates? Respect for a person's journey does not mean everyone else has lost a right to discuss the consequences. If the proposal is useful, it can be assessed through its substance. Accepting an entire biography as a source of unlimited power is unnecessary for that.

A quieter form of the same demand exists: someone expects loved ones immediately to confirm their new image. If they do not, they are declared unable to understand the depth of the changes. Sometimes they indeed do not know an important part of the experience, and an account helps. Sometimes they see recurring actions the person has preferred to leave outside the story. It helps not to decide beforehand which case we face. What exactly needs recognition: the journey's occurrence, a particular effort, a present decision, or the unconditional correctness of a new explanation of one's life? These requests are not equivalent.

A reader need not abandon a heroic image if it helps endure a difficult journey. What matters is giving it a limited job: supporting one's effort, rather than canceling others' participation. An inner story of overcoming can coexist with a need to explain an action, hear an objection, and

correct a mistake. The dignity of return then does not depend on an absence of questions. It appears in the ability to act among people again who have their own histories and a right to assess proposed terms. Recognition of effort remains possible without appointing a winner of the whole encounter.

V. An account of the journey should not remove its cost

After a journey, someone may want to assemble experience into a coherent narrative. This helps explain why they made decisions and what they now consider important. But coherence can manufacture excessive rightness: every doubt becomes a necessary trial, mistakes useful lessons, and incidental help a reward for inner worth. Such an account can be expressive while leaving no room for what happened differently or was not chosen. Returning to oneself can therefore usefully include a question about the accuracy of the account alongside the journey's meaning.

In the fictional workshop, someone describes changing profession through courage. A colleague recalls that a mutual acquaintance supported them for several months. This does not cancel the courage. But it changes the distribution of participation: the transition was not entirely independent. Support can be acknowledged without reducing one's own action to passivity. Likewise, a mistake successfully corrected need not retrospectively become a right decision. An account becomes more accurate when it permits effort, dependence on circumstances, help from others, and actions the person thinks about differently today to coexist.

Sometimes the journey's cost concerns other people. Someone stayed away longer than promised, failed to communicate a changed plan, or left an obligation undiscussed. Reunion does not require turning all this into an accusatory list. It may require particular recognition: what was done, who was affected, and what can now be repaired. Returning itself does not repair every consequence. Explaining a reason does not establish automatic forgiveness either. These are editorial distinctions; the article offers no rule for assessing every biography or method guaranteed to restore trust after a broken promise.

An obligation to tell has limits too. A person does not have to disclose every detail of their experience to everyone to earn a place among acquaintances. Private matters can remain theirs while information necessary for a particular shared decision is distinguished. They may choose not to discuss a painful episode, for example, but must honestly name their available workload if accepting an obligation. Privacy and responsibility then do not become enemies. Return involves a possibility of renewed contact, not handing an entire inner history to others for assessment. The extent of an account is chosen with the relationship and task in mind.

VI. Returning, repentance, and acceptance differ

The image of return appears in different texts but performs different tasks. In the passages read from Luke 15:17–24, KJV, a son decides to go to his father, acknowledges his wrongdoing, and receives a welcome exceeding the position of a worker he expected. This is part of a Christian parable, not another version of Odysseus's biography. A shared direction toward home permits a question about restoring connection. It does not make the grounds for recognition, religious meaning, characters' actions, and terms of acceptance identical. The complete chapter and its interpretations were not researched here.

In contemporary conversation, it helps to distinguish three statements. Being here again reports presence. Acknowledging a particular action reports responsibility. Being offered participation again reflects another person's decision or action. One does not automatically prove the other two. Someone can return without acknowledgment, acknowledge without resuming a former relationship, or receive help while trust remains an open question. This is our limited comparison, not a reconstruction of the entire Christian conception of repentance. It prevents an appealing reunion scene from becoming a promise that actual relationships must reach the same ending.

In a fictional example, a friend resumes contact after prolonged silence and proposes forgetting everything old. The other person is glad to hear from them but wants to discuss their disappearance from an important joint activity. Joy in contact and a question about the action can coexist. A conversation without preassigned forgiveness is possible; help without former intimacy is possible; full restoration is also possible if the participants choose it themselves. The article does not rank these responses by spiritual elevation. It preserves a distinction between offering connection and obliging another to accept it in a specified form.

For the returning person, this also removes an unnecessary demand. A complete transformation need not be proven first to make an understandable step. One can name one promise that is now feasible or one question they want to answer honestly. At the same time, a small step is not declared sufficient on behalf of all participants. Its meaning is determined within a particular relationship and may be clarified with time. A religious text remains a religious text; contemporary practice does not appropriate its promises. Respecting the difference makes comparison meaningful while preserving the unprescribed outcome of an actual conversation.

VII. Old craftsmanship needs present conditions

Let us return to the person beside the relocated table. An old ability has not necessarily disappeared because the first day was awkward. But a memory of working freely does not prove present readiness to act in the same way either. Tools, materials, schedules, bodily constraints, and tasks may have changed. It helps to try one particular operation under available conditions. This is not a test of personal worth. It is a way to see which part of the ability already works, what needs restoring, and what must be learned anew if the person actually wants to continue the occupation.

In a fictional scene, they start with a small order and discover that calculations succeed while using a new tool takes longer. Instead of a general conclusion that they are no longer the same, the difference can be clarified. What remains familiar? What function does the new tool perform? Where is a colleague's help needed? The answers describe a task that can be addressed. Reduced speed is not explained beforehand through age, inner conflict, or insufficient spiritual concentration. Its cause should be sought through observation and conditions, rather than selected from an attractive story about return.

Sometimes the trial shows that the old occupation is no longer wanted. This does not necessarily mean losing oneself. The journey may have changed interests, while a retained tool expresses respect for the past rather than a present intention. An ability can remain part of one's history without a duty constantly to prove its relevance. A new occupation can be chosen without declaring the old one a mistake. Connection with oneself then means being able to name present participation honestly. It does not require retaining every former role for biographical continuity or presenting a new decision as victory over a former person.

Not every change can be tested through a small action. Equipment, training, a partner's agreement, or an unavailable resource may be necessary. Our proposal does not turn the availability of a trial into everyone's obligation. First clarifying conditions, preparing a conversation, or recognizing that a decision is unavailable today may be appropriate. Even this clarification differs from a general judgment of one's own disappearance. It names an external or practical boundary and leaves the question open. Returning to an occupation may be gradual, partial, deferred, or replaced by another connection with what once mattered.

VIII. Wanting home is not a promise of an outcome

In the first section of Epictetus's Enchiridion, translated by Elizabeth Carter, a normative distinction is made between one's judgments and actions and what is not under the same authority, including reputation. This is not a study of return outcomes or proof that someone completely controls a reaction. In our limited comparison, it helps separate an intention to participate from a guarantee of another's response. An honest account can be prepared and a conversation offered. One effort cannot determine how we are received or what changes occur in others.

The fictional person plans another workshop visit and pictures joyful recognition beforehand. The wish is understandable: it expresses the value of former relationships. But making it a compulsory outcome turns any colleague's busyness into rejection of the whole person. The meeting can have a more precise task: learn what project is possible, describe one's experience, ask about current work. This does not guarantee satisfaction. It does distinguish an unpleasant feeling from the actual substance of an answer. A colleague may be busy today without rejecting the relationship altogether; they may also genuinely no longer want the former collaboration.

The distinction should not diminish a need for acceptance. A person may want closeness, support, and recognition. They can seek relationships in which these are possible and discuss participation's terms. Limited control does not mean indifference to consequences or prescribe accepting any treatment offered. They can assess whether the proposed connection suits them and choose another available form. Epictetus's normative thought remains one philosophical support, while the further discussion is our application. We do not derive from the ancient text one correct decision for every returning person.

Sometimes the most accurate action is changing an expectation after an answer. If a project has closed, another workplace can be sought. If a loved one asks for time, an acceptable form of contact can be discussed. If a promise remains operative, its fulfillment date can be clarified. This is no universal advice simply to release the past. It is an examinable relationship between a wish, circumstances, and the next decision. Returning to oneself is supported by the ability to respond to what happens while preserving an important wish and avoiding preassigned roles for others, rather than a guaranteed triumph of home's image.

IX. Continuation begins after the celebratory reunion

The moment of return has a strong form: an open door, recognition, conversation, an evening together. Life continues the next morning, however, when time, work, and attention need distributing again. It helps to ask what remains after a symbolic completion of the journey. Which obligation is the person actually ready to fulfill? Whom do they want to approach? Which occupation can begin under present conditions? These questions do not diminish the encounter's significance. They help it become a beginning of participation rather than proof that ordinary difficulties should no longer arise after the journey.

In the fictional workshop, the person leaves without the expected instant feeling of authenticity, but with an agreement to come on Thursday and try working together. It is a small outcome. It does not establish that the past is restored or that the entire journey has acquired meaning. It connects memory with an action that can be performed and assessed afterward. The work may succeed; a need for another form may become clear. Both outcomes have substance. An unsuitable first option need not prove an inability to be oneself or the meaninglessness of all preceding decisions.

A right to conclude the journey differently matters too. Home sometimes remains a place of memory while new participation appears far away. Former relationships sometimes continue through an occasional conversation. Sometimes a person no longer wants the word return and prefers to name a new period without mythological accompaniment. These are permissible forms of contemporary response, not alternative endings to The Odyssey itself. Our text does not change the literary plot for readers' convenience. It limits the plot's application so that personal history retains a right not to match the chosen image down to its final detail.

Odysseus helps us see arrival, recognition, trust, and further life as different tasks. Resolving one opens the next without automatically accomplishing it. Within this sequence, returning to oneself becomes less ceremonial and more concrete: recognizing present wishes, answering for available actions, acknowledging others' histories, and revising participation according to circumstances. This does not promise permanent wholeness. It offers a possibility of continuing one's life without having to prove either that the former person was wholly preserved or that every year of the journey was necessary for the present outcome.

What this means in practice

If you want to return to yourself, try naming one object of the wish without the general formula. Do you want to resume a particular occupation, renew contact, live somewhere familiar, or restore a specific quality of work? Several answers can remain alongside each other. Then clarify which conditions actually supported this before and which are available today. An address, a habit, a person, and a way of participating may require different decisions.

Choose a small action if possible: attend an agreed meeting, try one operation, ask about present terms of collaboration. Do not make it a hidden test of another person or an examination of your authenticity. Before acting, name what exactly you want to learn; afterward, note what happened and what remains unknown. One result concerns one task, not the entire worth of your history.

In conversation, acknowledge that time passed for everyone. Tell the part of the journey you are willing to tell and ask about what you did not see. If an old promise needs discussing, name it separately from joy in the reunion. Do not promise more than you are currently ready to do, and leave the other person a right to their own tempo, response, and form of participation.

Finally, identify the next ordinary day. What can you continue after a strong feeling of return, or after its absence? In the opening scene, it is enough to agree honestly on another attempt at work, without finding final proof of oneself. The workshop may become important again. It may also not. The person can still relate the answer received to their wish and choose further participation without passing judgment on the entire journey.

Key quotation

> *We have suffered, both of us.*

Homer, The Odyssey, XXIII; English translation by Samuel Butler. Text. Penelope says this to Odysseus after recognising him. The line names the suffering they have both endured.

Connections between traditions

Comparison	What is considered	Limitation
Odysseus's plot ↔ a contemporary metaphor of oneself	Arrival and recognition are different tasks.	The myth establishes neither a psychological law nor an unchanging core of personality.
Penelope ↔ a present conversation about trust	Wanting to accept differs from grounds for acceptance.	A plot's test is not proposed as a hidden trial of a loved one.
The Odyssey ↔ Luke 15:17–24	Returning opens a question about restoring connection.	The Christian parable and heroic epic have different meanings and participants.
Epictetus ↔ anticipating an encounter	Available action is distinguished from a guarantee of another's reaction.	A normative distinction is not experimental evidence of control.
Memory ↔ present craftsmanship	An important quality of the past can be tried under current conditions.	An editorial proposal does not promise restoration of every skill.

This map proves neither agreement among traditions nor historical influence. Contemporary scenes are fictional; comparison is limited to the stated question.

Primary sources

1. Homer, The Odyssey, XXIII. Samuel Butler, Internet Classics Archive. Translation information and the displayed Book XXIII text were read, particularly recognition, Penelope's explanation, and continuation after reunion. Not the whole epic. The site's dating is not used as an established scholarly creation date.

2. Luke 15:17–24, King James Version. Eight verses and the displayed KJV rights label were read. Neither the whole chapter nor the parable's full interpretive context was researched; brief paraphrase without direct quotation.

3. Epictetus, The Enchiridion, §1. Elizabeth Carter, Internet Classics Archive. Header, §1, and selected context in 4–17 were read earlier in this batch; only the first section's normative distinction is used here, without quotation or biographical claims.

International reuse rights for the particular electronic copies have not been established: UNKNOWN. The KJV Public Domain label does not replace territorial verification. Full source texts are not reproduced; explicitly excluded Sujato/SuttaCentral versions were not used.

Tags

Odysseus, Penelope, Ithaca, Homer, Odyssey, Samuel Butler, return, recognition, trust, home, memory, journey, personal history, craftsmanship, participation, expectations, responsibility, privacy, promise, circumstances, Epictetus, Enchiridion, Elizabeth Carter, Luke, parable, repentance, acceptance, metaphor, fictional scene, UNKNOWN

About the authors

Andrey Zarinsh is the author and founder of United Wisdom. He explores inner transformation, unity among 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.