

UNITED WISDOM

How to Notice What Self-Inquiry Helps With

The Person and the Inner World

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

I-26-N04 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

How to Notice What Self-Inquiry Helps With

Epigraph

> *“Doers of the word.” — James 1:22, a brief fragment of the World English Bible, with display capitalisation. A Christian teaching on hearing and doing; neither a demand to enact every thought immediately nor a measure of human worth through productivity.*

What this article is about

Sometimes a long period of reflection leaves a peculiar feeling: I have said a great deal about myself, but is anything clearer? The record is detailed, several explanations have emerged, and a habit has even acquired a fitting name. Yet the next ordinary episode presents much the same uncertain question. On another day a short observation makes a particular agreement visible, and a next action becomes more available. These situations establish no simple rule about reflection’s correct duration. They suggest asking first what work the thinking was expected to do, and which limited signs could reveal its result without turning the question into an examination of one’s personality.

Benefit here means neither constant calm nor rapid decisions nor always managing without help. A situation can become better understood while remaining upsetting. A limit of knowledge can be recognised and another person approached. A question may turn out not to be answerable through writing at present and be left until information arrives. Sometimes the result is clarification of a word previously used to explain very different events. Such changes matter in relation to a particular task. They cannot be promised to every reader or treated as established therapeutic effects. This article offers a way to consider a possible result, rather than a system for measuring health, maturity or success.

Consider a fictional scene. Pavel helps organise an amateur photography meeting. After a message about a changed time, he writes that once again he has not been considered. On returning to the episode he finds two questions: who agreed the change, and which time he himself previously confirmed. He does not yet know the first answer. For the second, he finds his own message containing an uncertain promise. Terms can be clarified and his actual availability stated. This scene proves no method’s effectiveness. It makes a change between an initial explanation and a possible next step visible. The external change remains a real event; Pavel’s clarification does not cancel the organisers’ responsibility.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

I. Name the work expected first

The question of benefit easily becomes too broad: has thinking made me better overall? Mood, decision quality, self-regard, other people's actions and later circumstances become mixed together. One episode can have a more definite subject. Pavel wants to understand what the agreement about time lacked, rather than establish the final cause of every disappointment. The result under examination is correspondingly limited: has information about the agreement appeared, is a next question clear, and can his own message be distinguished from an assumption about another's intention? An answer need not cover a whole life or confirm self-inquiry's general value.

The chosen subject is not always action. A person may need words for an indistinct experience, a distinction between expectations, or recognition that particular material is not something they want to discuss now. These too are possible tasks. They should not be replaced by a demand for immediate decisions where no decision was needed. Equally, lengthy description does not prove completion. What became available can be named: a question was formulated, an unknown retained, a boundary stated. If nothing of that kind is visible yet, this concerns the examination rather than judging the person. Other conditions, another format or suitable help may be needed.

Pavel can separately ask whether he wants to keep helping the meeting under the proposed terms. That question should not silently become whether every organiser is fair. Both may matter, but require different material. Considering benefit begins with distinguishing tasks rather than giving the whole process one rating. Sometimes this reveals that a personal note was expected to produce an answer held by another participant. The change then consists in identifying missing information. Writing has not become useless because it did not create that information: it has revealed its function's boundary and a possible person to ask.

II. More reflection does not necessarily mean more clarity

In their 2002 SRIS study, Grant, Franklin and Langford distinguished self-reflection from clarity of understanding. Three studies used student samples. Comparing journal-keepers with others did not randomly assign the practice, so it establishes neither benefit nor harm caused by journals. This offers a limited research reason to distinguish self-directed attention from understanding obtained; it diagnoses no reader.

That distinction can be considered in a personal note without applying someone else's scale to oneself. Page count measures text's extent; duration measures time. Neither alone answers whether the task was addressed. Pavel may produce several new pages about being undervalued and still not know who announced the time. He may briefly identify missing information and find the question more definite. Short records are not being declared

universally better than long ones. Each may serve another function, including freely expressing experience. The point is to avoid substituting one indicator for another without explaining the relationship.

Clarity need not become certainty about every conclusion either. Sometimes it is more precise not-knowing: I know which message I sent, but not who decided to change the time. That differs from a general belief that nobody ever considers me. The distinction does not automatically make the organisers attentive or right. It identifies what can be discussed as established and what remains a question. If evidence of a genuinely broken agreement subsequently appears, it enters with its own significance. Clarification does not require choosing a favourable explanation for someone else or abandoning evaluation of their behaviour beforehand.

III. Compare two descriptions of the same task

A simple examination may retain a brief initial formulation and later note what changed. Pavel initially connected the event with others' general attitude towards him. After reading the messages, he distinguished an announcement, his own promise and an unknown decision participant. Such comparison concerns the question's composition. It is no controlled experiment and establishes no change caused specifically by writing. New information, conversation, rest or passing time could also contribute. Naming the sequence honestly is better than making an available example prove a single mechanism. A causal explanation's detail should fit the material actually available.

Comparison requires preserving time differences. Rewriting the first formulation as though Pavel understood everything from the beginning would erase the visible path. He need not keep every draft forever or publish it, however. A small dated note can remain where safe and useful. If there is no original record, the initial description can be labelled as reconstructed from memory. This is a less precise comparison basis. It does not make every discussion of benefit impossible, but limits confidence in details. Previous words, durations or frequencies should not be invented merely to create a tidy story of personal progress.

A useful question for two descriptions is whether something formerly combined is now distinguishable. The answer can be small. Meeting time and my participation concern different subjects. Hurt and evidence of deliberate disregard differ. Clarifying terms and asking someone to acknowledge that I am right are different requests. Each distinction is considered on its merits without needing to become a great discovery. If it does not help the task, that can be acknowledged. A new word sometimes only repeats an old explanation in a more complicated form. Elegant phrasing then provides no separate evidence of accuracy or practical suitability.

IV. See what became possible

A next step makes a result concrete when the task actually involved action. In Pavel’s scene it could be a question about the new time and a clear statement of availability. Action cannot be evaluated solely through having happened, however. A sharp accusation changes a situation too without necessarily fitting the task. Does a step use clarified knowledge, account for unknowns and preserve necessary conditions? These are editorial prompts rather than a universal scale of correct behaviour. They authorise neither testing another person secretly nor creating a conflict to evaluate one’s own attentiveness.

In the selected passage of Book II of the Nicomachean Ethics, Aristotle distinguishes an act from the conditions in which someone acts, including knowledge and choice. The philosophical comparison is limited: an outward result alone does not support a general judgement about a person. Ancient virtues, medical analogies and demands for stable character become neither a contemporary mental-health test nor instructions to face danger.

Sometimes declining an unsuitable action becomes possible instead. Pavel notices that he lacks evidence for an accusation of planned disregard and decides against sending it for now. This does not require abandoning a question about the actual change or accepting an inconvenient time. Where a decision already has a deadline, endless clarification is no advantage in itself. A proportionate choice can use available knowledge while retaining unknowns. With medical, legal or financial circumstances, the personal next step may involve competent assistance rather than an independent experiment with consequences.

V. Relief matters without answering everything

Writing may bring relief. That is a real experience which need not be dismissed because it proves no conclusion correct. Relief and resolution nevertheless remain different results. Pavel might feel supported after talking to a friend and still not know the meeting’s terms. He might clarify an agreement and remain upset about changed plans. Neither possibility automatically establishes failure. Emotional change and a change in available knowledge or action can be named separately. A person then need not choose between acknowledging experience and being honest about an unresolved subject.

The same applies to unpleasant feelings after clarification. Learning that a promise really was broken may hurt. Acknowledging one’s uncertainty may be uncomfortable. This article requires neither treating every upset as beneficial nor enduring deterioration for supposed growth. It simply does not use a lack of immediate calm as the sole criterion of uselessness. Conditions, difficulty, support and the task itself matter. If examination intensifies serious distress, interferes with necessary care or makes safety difficult, the unsuitable format should stop and

appropriate help be sought. That boundary should not become another test of enduring self-inquiry correctly.

A mood need not be prescribed as every note’s destination. This introduces another assessment subject, sometimes distant from the initial question. Partial answers, stated unknowns or a decision to return later are possible endings. Someone wishing simply to express experience may regard that function as sufficient for now. If the purpose was clarifying an agreement, emotional expression alone does not replace missing information. This distinction creates no hierarchy in which emotions are supposedly less worthy than thought. It preserves both tasks without attributing to one a result that belonged to the other.

Not all significant personal material fits an assessment of usefulness. Remembering someone close, freely describing a day or wishing to preserve an experience may involve no improvement task. A person need not prove such writing practically effective to have a right to it. If a result question does arise, its particular subject can be clarified. Pavel keeps a note because the day matters to him; separately, he examines an agreement he wants to clarify. One record can contain both subjects. Assessing the second neither cancels the first’s value nor requires subordinating a whole personal life to measurable change.

VI. Respect what action’s conditions allow

Even a well-formulated next step may be unavailable now. Another person is not answering, a decision belongs elsewhere, or time and resources are lacking. A lack of immediate action under these conditions does not prove a failure to understand. What depends on the person can be distinguished from what requires others. Pavel can state his availability without approving the group’s schedule alone. This preserves responsibility without promising complete control. Benefit from understanding can be considered within actual limits, rather than rating a person by an outcome they do not command and which involves several participants.

Conditions include keeping personal material private. Useful clarification may remain internal: I understand that I want to ask about the time, without wanting to tell an organiser my whole history of hurt. This makes neither a superficial nor a dishonest conversation. Particular information may suffice for an agreement. If appropriate assistance requires certain information, its extent and conditions should instead be discussed with the relevant professional. A short article cannot prescribe every professional conversation. A result of self-inquiry may be a more precise selection of material for a task, preserving personal boundaries and necessary work.

Sometimes an unnecessary demand on oneself can be reduced. Pavel need not explain every earlier similar incident completely before the organiser answers. He can limit examination to

this event. That is no universal instruction to forget history: earlier material can matter with repeated breaches. Scope is selected for the question and circumstances, rather than completeness as a virtue in itself. A clear reason to stop can be used. Self-inquiry need not occupy every spare pause simply because another question can always be found and continued without an obvious endpoint.

VII. Do not claim the entire good outcome

Suppose the organisers promptly clarify the time and Pavel can attend. Saying self-inquiry fixed everything would be tempting. In this fictional scene, however, another person’s answer and an ability to alter plans also mattered. Pavel prepared a more definite message and received needed information. That is already a meaningful result requiring no single-cause success story. Claiming benefit too broadly can make a later failure seem its mirror image: proof of personal inadequacy. More precise description preserves personal contribution and events outside one’s control without needing to establish that inner work alone determined the meeting’s outcome.

If Pavel still cannot attend, the clarification does not cease to exist. Equally, every outcome should not be called success just to make a practice always look useful. Return to its limited task. Did it help prepare a question? Did an answer arrive? Were the terms still unsuitable? Those answers differ. Partial benefit and an unresolved problem can coexist. Sometimes examination produces no available change at all. This can be named directly; another method, stopping or seeking help remains possible. Honest evaluation allows no result. Otherwise usefulness stops distinguishing anything and merely defends the process itself.

One case establishes no lasting future skill. Pavel may distinguish questions today and combine them again tomorrow. This is no reason either to dismiss the first episode or promise automatic improvement soon. Discussing repetition requires material from several actual situations, with differences in conditions visible and without invented counts. The article prescribes no required number of records or clinical progress indicator. A modest statement can suffice: in this case this part of the question became nameable. A wider conclusion requires a wider basis rather than a single persuasive account.

VIII. If benefit is not visible yet

A missing visible result can have different explanations; none should be selected automatically. The question may be too broad, material insufficient, the format unsuitable, external information necessary, or energy unavailable. A result may have been expected that this work cannot promise. Begin with the selected subject and conditions rather than declaring laziness, resistance or hidden advantage without grounds. Such labels look explanatory but may simply replace not-knowing with personality judgement. Naming what did not happen and what is missing is more precise, while preserving the possibility of another way to work.

Sometimes limiting examination to one question helps. Pavel need not simultaneously investigate the group’s history, every personal expectation and each participant’s motives. His available time and information about the change can come first. Sometimes a pause or conversation is needed. Sometimes there is no need to continue self-inquiry about this case at all. That choice requires no defence of a supposed hidden benefit. A person can select another way to address an ordinary question. Starting a practice makes it no obligation, and time already spent creates no debt to reach an impressive discovery.

With persistent serious difficulty or safety, the choice extends beyond a better question for a journal. Suitable professional or urgent local help has its own function. Analysis need not finish before a person may seek it. Prescribed treatment should not change through personal interpretation, nor necessary protection wait for proven reflection benefits. This is the article’s boundary rather than a claim that every unresolved question is a disorder. Ordinary not-knowing and serious need for assistance require distinction. Personal examination may accompany appropriate work but should not automatically replace it where expertise and real actions are already necessary.

IX. A small check on an ordinary episode

For a voluntary safe trial, select a small everyday question requiring no urgent decision, treatment or test of dangerous relationships. Name the task in an accessible sentence. After brief examination, note what became distinguishable, what remains unknown and which step is actually possible. A change in experience can be noted separately if relevant. This is an editorial observation format rather than a scientifically validated programme or scale. It may be simplified, omitted or stopped. No new difficulty, deprivation of rest or provocation of someone else is needed to produce a visible self-inquiry result.

Compare descriptions in relation to the chosen subject. If clarifying a question was the task, has an answerable question appeared? If participation terms were being considered, which terms are now named, and who needs to agree them? Different tasks require no identical results. Pavel might note his availability, the unknown group decision and a prepared question.

That establishes no general gain in objectivity across relationships; it retains particular material. Scores, comparisons with others and sending someone a personal journal to confirm a correct way of thinking are unnecessary.

Later events after an available step can be added, while distinguishing the initial result from the subsequent outcome. If no answer arrives, that is new information about conditions rather than an automatic diagnosis of inner work. If an answer comes, another’s decision content should not be claimed as one’s own contribution. The note may remain small and private; others’ details belong only to the extent appropriate to the task. Increased difficulty permits stopping and suitable support. Important medical, legal and financial matters retain competent work. Safety and necessary real actions are not objects for this small trial.

X. Benefit can be partial and concrete enough

Noticing benefit sometimes means saying less than one wishes. In this episode I distinguished a fact and hypothesis, identified information needed, or stated an available action or participation limit. Immediate calm did not appear, but the question’s open part is clearer. These statements make no model of maturity and promise no continuing result. They reveal a small change with its conditions. Pavel need not turn one exchange into personal rebirth. Understanding what happened to this question, and which further work belongs to information, conversation or relevant expertise, may suffice.

In the selected Christian passage, James compares hearing with doing. That is a distinct religious perspective rather than a contemporary efficiency programme. Personal examination does not thereby require acting on every thought. Choice, suitable circumstances and declining an unsuitable step matter. Self-inquiry’s usefulness remains a question about particular work: what did it make visible, and what can now be addressed more clearly? An answer may be limited, negative or unfinished. A person becomes neither more nor less worthy according to whether today’s writing produced a convincing result.

What this means in practice

Identify a task before evaluating a result. Distinguish reflection’s extent, a question’s clarity, experiential change, a step’s availability and a later outcome. For an ordinary safe episode, a brief initial description can be retained alongside what became known or distinguishable. New information and others’ participation enter with their statuses; a sequence proves no sole cause. Relief, immediate action or final answers are unnecessary requirements. Partial benefit, no visible result and the format’s limits can be acknowledged. A description reconstructed from memory should be labelled accordingly: a tidy account matters less than honesty about available material.

Use no such check as a measure of worth, a diagnosis or a demand for continuous improvement. Steps fit actual conditions and may involve clarification, declining, stopping or seeking help. Create neither risk nor conflict to test understanding, and change no prescribed assistance through a private conclusion. Important matters retain professional expertise; safety gives necessary local action priority. A record can remain small and private. A sufficient result for this case may be straightforward: the question under consideration, what is unknown and what is actually available next are visible, without promising complete control over the outcome.

Key quotation

> *“Choose the acts.” — Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics II.4, a brief fragment of W. D. Ross’s translation, with display capitalisation. A philosophical distinction involving choice and outward action; no ready-made assessment of health, character or self-inquiry’s effectiveness.*

Connections between traditions

• **Aristotle, II.4:** action distinguished from its conditions. Ancient ethics becomes no contemporary diagnostic scale.

• **James 1:22–25:** a religious comparison of hearing and doing. Neither compulsory enactment of every thought nor worth measured through results.

• **Grant, Franklin and Langford, 2002:** reflection distinguished from clarity in SRIS research. Limited samples and an observational comparison prove no causal journal effect.

• **Editorial approach:** a particular task, discernible result and actual conditions. Comparisons preserve the sources’ different functions.

Sources

1. Aristotle. Nicomachean Ethics II.4. Internet Classics Archive, translated by W. D. Ross. The selected passage 57–63, surrounding text 26–75 and metadata 11–24 were read, not the whole treatise. The printed translation edition was not established. Rights UNKNOWN; source text is neither imported nor embedded. The quotation budget remains shared across the treatise.

2. James 1:22–25. World English Bible, chapter 1. The complete short chapter and publisher’s public-domain text declaration were read. The Russian fragment is editorial rather than a branded Russian WEB. Source text is neither imported nor embedded nor used for training; the work’s quotation limit remains.

3. Anthony M. Grant, John Franklin and Peter Langford. The Self-Reflection and Insight Scale: A new measure of private self-consciousness. Social Behavior and Personality, 2002, 30(8), 821–836. Publisher, DOI 10.2224/sbp.2002.30.8.821. The abstract, three studies' methods, discussion and limitations were read in HTML. The complete PDF, scale items, tables and data were not checked. © 2002 Scientific Journal Publishers Limited, all rights reserved, is preserved. No direct quotations; source text is neither imported nor embedded.

Tags

self-inquiry, benefit, reflection, understanding, clarity, question, result, action, choice, conditions, observation, record, journal, comparison, unknowns, limitation, responsibility, experience, relief, help, independence, boundaries, causality, evidence, partial result, practice, agreement, next step, Aristotle, James, SRIS, specificity

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.