

UNITED WISDOM

Faith as trust, conviction and practice

Meaning and Direction

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

P12 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Faith as trust, conviction and practice

Epigraph

“Now faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen.”

— Hebrews11:1, King James Version. The complete chapter includes suffering and the promise not received during a lifetime; the verse guarantees no worldly success.

What this article is about

Faith can name assent to a proposition, trust and participation in a meaningful action. These aspects may connect, yet one does not automatically reveal everything about the others. We consider their relationship through an invented scene at a religious community’s gathering: what someone accepts, whom they trust and in what respect, how they participate and which questions remain. Selected passages from Thomas Aquinas, William James and two biblical chapters serve as interlocutors without their different grounds becoming one teaching. We represent no entire history of religions and determine no test of a true believer. Contemporary situations and the practice are original editorial work. Accurate participation, respectful conversation and honestly naming incompleteness without promising final clarity remain central. No religious propositions are proved here, and sincerity is not measured through outward form or emotional intensity.

I. One word can name different relationships

Imagine an adult woman attending a small religious community’s gathering with a friend. She appreciates how people are addressed there and how they help prepare a shared meal. She accepts some of the statements she hears, while remaining unconvinced by others. She can help with cooking but is unsure how to understand the communal prayer. Asking immediately whether she has faith makes the answer too narrow for what is happening. Trust in her friend, assent to a particular statement and participation in an activity are already present without coinciding. This is an invented scene, not a report of an actual community. Its question is modest: what exactly are we asking to hear when one word is used for several relationships at once, and which part of her participation deserves an accurate description?

Here trust means being willing to rely on someone, or address them, in a particular respect. Conviction means taking a certain content to be true. Practice means an action with a form, circumstances and significance for its participant. These are working distinctions for reading, not a definition of every religion or three stages everyone must complete. A particular tradition may relate them differently from our invented conversation. Someone may trust an

acquaintance without accepting that person’s theology, regard a proposition as true without acting on it, or participate in a rite whose meaning is still being considered. One feature alone gives no sufficient ground for attributing the other two. Accuracy starts with the object and scope of the relationship rather than an encompassing label that seems to supply all the missing information.

The distinction can also matter to someone who has called themselves a believer for years. A familiar formula may be known while its connection to trust in a particular undertaking remains difficult to explain. A meaningful action may continue while one representation is reconsidered. Beliefs may be articulated fluently while promised help remains merely verbal. Naming these differences, however, need not become a search for concealed insincerity. Between a label and an action there may be incomplete understanding, limited opportunity, another meaning or an unfinished question. The article proposes describing the connection before discussing its grounds. No public account of faith is required. A conversation may remain personal and partial, or never take place if someone does not wish to enter it now and has made no promise to do so.

II. A conviction has content that can be questioned

The words “I believe” can defend an entire relationship when only one statement was under discussion. At our invented gathering, the visitor asks whether a particular account must be accepted literally. Her interlocutor hears a rejection of the community’s values and begins defending its dignity; the question about content disappears. A more precise conversation would identify the statement, what literal acceptance means here and why the question matters. Agreement on one point would then become no automatic promise to accept every other one, while doubt would not be treated as an announced rejection of friendship. This preserves the seriousness of disagreement. A difference becomes discussable when its location, the grounds offered and the answer considered sufficient for continued participation are clear, rather than replaced by defending everything at once.

In Summa Theologiae II–II, question2, articles1–2, Thomas Aquinas considers faith through intellectual assent and the will, distinguishing it from clear sight of what is known. He distinguishes relations to God as content, ground of assent and end, rather than three independent faiths. This is particular Christian theology, not our neutral classification of everyday convictions. It brings questions of content and grounds alongside each other while remaining distinct from James. The comparison supplies no proof of God’s existence or description of every believer. Reading a historical interlocutor need not begin by accepting all his premises, but it requires retaining those premises rather than replacing them with a convenient modern vocabulary that changes what he is discussing.

A conviction can be clarified without promising to resolve a great dispute immediately. Which words do I actually accept? On what grounds? What remains open? These questions serve different tasks: one concerns meaning, another reliance on testimony, another an argument. Not every answer is assessed in the same way, but that does not make all answers interchangeable. A story about an acquaintance’s actual deed, for example, calls for information about that deed. A theological statement is discussed through specified grounds the interlocutor may not accept. Respect for a person cannot be transferred automatically into accepting every message they deliver as true. Respect can accompany a stated disagreement. Conviction then remains a substantive relationship to truth, while conversation remains a relationship between people who need not agree in every respect to address each other accurately.

III. Trust needs an object and a scope

The visitor trusts her friend to choose a suitable time and explain how the meal is organised. That gives the friend no authority to decide which statements she should make in her own name. Someone may rely on a caring person in one area and independently examine that person’s messages in another. This need not indicate insufficient closeness. Trust has an intelligible form when what was entrusted, what remains one’s own decision and where information is required are known. If someone promised to explain participation, an explanation is expected, not an answer to every question of life. Limited trust can be substantive precisely because participants know its boundary and do not use it to obtain unrequested agreement which the other person has not yet given, even if a fuller relationship might eventually develop.

In religious use, trust can be directed towards God, a promise or a tradition’s significance; this address is not reduced here to reliance on a familiar organiser. In Hebrews11, faith is related to hope and the unseen. Its later examples include action, pilgrimage, suffering and a promise not received within a lifetime. The opening line therefore offers no guarantee of success to every believer. This is canonical religious testimony, not a measurement of which convictions produce better outcomes. Our contemporary scene remains separate. A comparable question about trust does not turn different grounds into alternative words for the same thing. Nor does it permit promising the visitor an outcome which neither her friend nor this article can know beforehand or deliver through the explanation of a meaningful relationship.

A boundary also matters in respectful guidance. Someone may ask for an explanation of prayer without authorising the interlocutor to make every subsequent decision for them. A useful explanation names its own tradition, the action’s order and the possibility of asking a question. If trust must instead be proved by abandoning every clarification, the subject has changed into a condition of submission. This article sets no rules for every community and judges no whole group of teachers through one scene. It leaves a question about a particular

relationship: what am I agreeing to trust, which commitment am I accepting, and can I state my disagreement accurately? Distinguishing these matters preserves trust as a relationship with another person, rather than treating that person only as the supplier of a convenient answer that has already been demanded.

IV. Participation reveals no complete account of inward assent

Suppose the visitor decides to remain for the communal prayer while explaining beforehand that she wishes to listen, rather than say words whose meaning she has not accepted. Her friend explains the possible forms of participation, and the others accept her presence. In this invented scene, a boundary becomes part of a shared action. No complete certainty has to be performed and nobody's thoughts have to be guessed. Elsewhere the order may differ; someone can ask about it before promising participation they cannot honestly undertake. Practice has a particular form. Renaming an activity does not make every form available to every participant. Clarification distinguishes permission to be present from a requirement to speak in one's own name words with which one does not currently agree, while leaving the meaning of others' participation intact.

From outside, similar actions can appear to express an identical faith. Two people stand together, hear the same text and follow the same order. An observer knows only the accessible part: presence, words and some circumstances. One participant may express an acknowledged address to God; another may accompany someone close in a permitted role; a third may be considering a personal question. These possibilities do not make practice an empty shell. They show why an action's significance cannot be described accurately while excluding its participant's relationship to it in advance. Where a form presupposes a particular profession, that condition should be stated honestly. Where presence without it is possible, no promise should be attributed merely because outward conduct resembles a familiar image of faith in the observer's mind.

Continuing a familiar action also needs its own description. A meaningful order can be maintained without vivid feeling; the absence of vividness need not prove emptiness. The action can also become automatic, prompting a wish to reconsider its significance. Neither possibility is established through a photograph or brief answer. "What am I doing here?" differs from "What should others think about me?" The former can name address, memory, shared participation or a meaning still open. The latter can turn the action into a way of securing the approved assessment. External form is neither prohibited here nor subjected to constant self-analysis. Sometimes its relationship to participation can be clarified without making every moment an examination of sincerity or assigning other people the authority to grade someone's inward life through outward appearances.

V. Professed faith and the treatment of another person

James2 addresses favour towards the rich, the insufficiency of good wishes for someone in need, and faith’s relationship to works. It is a Christian text with its own concern about salvation, not a universal formula for assessing all religions. Its example draws attention to a difference between a professed relationship and what another person receives. The verse becomes no calculation of a believer’s usefulness or demand to assist everyone at any cost. Our comparison is limited: words of care may overlook a particular need. The following scene is original, not a report of an established event. It concerns available action and agreed possibilities while keeping the source’s theological meaning distinct from practical reasoning about a communal meal and someone invited to attend it.

Someone is invited to the table, yet nobody asks whether the time or room permits their participation. The organisers speak sincerely about attention, but an invitation alone does not make attendance possible. Circumstances can be clarified without demanding a personal history. Available changes can be named, alongside what the group cannot currently provide. This becomes a concrete conversation about a shared undertaking. Replacing the response with an assertion that faith should overcome every difficulty makes the actual problem disappear. The reverse inference is also too broad: one poorly organised event cannot establish the falsity of every participant’s convictions. A real shortcoming, the possibility of correcting it and a larger dispute about foundations should be distinguished. Neither a lovely wish nor a single scheduling mistake resolves all three questions at once.

Help does not purchase assent either. Preparing a meal does not oblige the visitor to repeat every organiser’s conviction; receiving assistance does not remove the recipient’s right to question or decline future participation. Otherwise a good deed quietly becomes a bill presented for someone’s independence. Care can have specified religious grounds which are openly explained, without requiring the recipient to adopt them as the price of respect. A shared event may nevertheless have limits which should be stated beforehand. Accuracy means clarity about what is offered, what is required and what needs a separate agreement, rather than a promise of unlimited openness. Care has its own significance when the other person is recognised as a participant in the situation, not treated as future confirmation that one’s own faith was right all along.

VI. Incomplete certainty and the possibility of choice

In The Will to Believe, William James distinguishes a living, forced and momentous option, defending the participation of our interested nature where such an option cannot be decided intellectually. SectionVIII also retains waiting for evidence where the option is not forced. This defends a limited philosophical right, not taking every desired proposition as true, and its grounds differ from Aquinas's. Our example is not declared an established instance of James's option. It prompts questions about what already requires a decision, what can actually wait and which information is available. Faith and checking a fact need not displace each other when the question being answered and the grounds presently available are specified, rather than treating every uncertainty as the same sort of choice.

At the invented gathering, some matters can be settled without a final answer about faith. The meal invitation can be accepted, a role agreed and discussion continued later. An unfamiliar formula can remain unspoken while its meaning is explained. These actions have limited objects. By contrast, someone asked to affirm a whole profession immediately needs to understand the conditions, words and their own readiness. An invitation does not itself prove that refusal or postponement is impossible. Another person's deadline and the logical impossibility of avoiding choice are different matters. A precise question sometimes reveals a third possibility initially unnoticed. Sometimes the alternatives remain difficult; then an honest account of their costs serves better than declaring the convenient answer the only possible one and assigning it unquestionable truth because uncertainty feels uncomfortable.

A small step can be accepted without claiming a complete conviction. This is no universal recommendation to try every practice: an action's meaning, consequences and others' expectations need to be learned in its particular setting. A commitment should not be concealed under the word "try." Where none is created, it should not be invented to make a story of transformation more persuasive. Responsibility includes accurately naming one's decision: listening, asking, accepting this proposition, taking this role or refraining for now. No such statement has to explain an entire biography. A partial answer may suffice for the immediate undertaking while remaining insufficient for a major theological question. Allowing answers different sizes preserves both faith's seriousness and someone's possibility of proceeding without an invented final clarity which they neither possess nor have undertaken to deliver.

VII. An experience matters while its meaning remains a question

After the gathering, the visitor may say she felt close to others. Her account matters: it reports her own experience, which need not be devalued beforehand. It does not yet answer every question about faith. Closeness may relate to conversation, a familiar order, her friend’s attention or a religious meaning she accepted; the explanation is not selected for her here. What mattered can be asked, and an incomplete answer acknowledged. An experience need not immediately become proof or an obligation to repeat it. It may remain an event she revisits willingly, considering its relationship to conviction and practice rather than fulfilling a story of personal transformation already composed by someone else who expects her next action to confirm it.

Another participant may experience nothing vivid yet find attendance meaningful. An address to God, shared memory or a promise to be present may matter to them. No strong feeling does not automatically mean no relationship. Equally, declaring every repetition substantive would be too convenient. Meaning remains a question about the action: what is sustained, what accepted, what habitual and what needs clarification? An answer can include incompleteness without pronouncing someone a poor believer. Reflection differs from continually measuring an inward state. It returns attention to meaning and circumstances while setting no required emotional intensity for every gathering, prayer or conversation with someone close, who remains entitled to understand the same occasion differently and need not provide a matching feeling to make their participation intelligible.

If an impression changes someone’s view, the size of that change can be named. A formula is understood differently; a practice’s history becomes interesting; an earlier explanation is questioned; a particular participation becomes possible. These answers differ and can matter without declaring a whole personality transformed. A conviction sometimes persists while how one addresses another changes. A conviction may change while a familiar form continues temporarily. Where that form contains a promise, its honesty requires separate attention; where it does not, none should be invented for a dramatic conclusion. No sequence of change is predicted or accelerated here. Accurate description allows an event its significance without making it larger than what the person is actually prepared to say about it and undertake because of it.

VIII. Different grounds can be discussed without declaring them one

The selected sources do not supply a common formula making theology, canonical testimony and a philosophical defence of choice interchangeable. Aquinas reasons within a particular relationship to God; James defends a specified right in philosophical debate. The biblical chapters retain their community address and religious grounds. Assent, action and hope can become adjacent questions without headings erasing differences between answers. This article represents neither every Christian position nor other religions. A limited scope allows closer reading: a conversation can gain sufficient depth without undertaking the entire history of faith or conveniently concluding that every tradition finally says the same thing once its language has been simplified enough to resemble our own preferred description of participation.

In the invented group, two people can prepare the meal on different grounds. One regards care as part of faith; another supports people close to them without sharing a religious conviction. Their agreement about time, tasks and the treatment of guests can be real. It requires neither hiding the difference nor adopting the other explanation as one’s own. Shared work does not resolve the whole dispute about faith. If they wish to discuss it later, particular propositions need words; chopping vegetables successfully together does not settle them. Practical connection and unity of foundations have different scopes. The work can be respected without feigned agreement, and a conviction retained without recasting another participant as someone who secretly accepted it already and simply failed to understand their own action.

Disagreement need not become a test of dignity. A proposition can be judged mistaken and its grounds challenged while its speaker is heard accurately. Shared assistance can be acknowledged without treating it as proof of a theology. Where disagreement concerns an event’s conditions, a particular agreement is needed: what is possible here, who decides and what nobody has to pretend. Differences are not always easily accommodated; participation may remain impossible in the selected form. Acknowledging that limit honestly serves better than verbal agreement followed by mutual accusation. Conversation retains meaning when a difference receives its own name and becomes neither an automatic threat to every relationship nor an empty detail to be ignored for a convenient collective image of unity which none of the participants actually shares.

IX. Accuracy leaves room for a living relationship

Return to the beginning. The visitor can end the day without answering the general question “Am I a believer?” yet understand several matters better. She trusts her friend in a particular undertaking, accepts one thought while wishing to clarify another, and knows the participation she honestly undertook. This need not be a first step towards a predetermined outcome. She may continue acquaintance, choose another involvement or stop. The relationship becomes more precise without necessarily growing. A later changed conviction would not turn the earlier scene retrospectively into a promise of that change. The day’s significance remains in what occurred, who participated, what was said and which questions remained, rather than the single ending an observer would prefer for an attractive story about faith.

For someone already living within a specified faith, the same distinctions may prompt another question. How does an accepted conviction relate to address and everyday conduct? What is called trust when the result remains uncertain? What genuinely expresses participation in a familiar form? The answer need not be unusual. A simple deed sometimes returns to its meaning: providing promised help, reading a selected text attentively, explaining refusal without degrading another or naming a personal question accurately. A relationship may also emerge which someone wishes to change. This article makes no decision about which outcome is religiously right for them. It offers distinctions for reflection; a theological answer and personal participation require their own grounds, which do not appear automatically from a completed essay or from a successful vocabulary that sounds reassuringly comprehensive.

Faith remains a serious word when it is not required to explain everything without clarification. Conviction, trust and action may be connected within it; the connection may be strained, clear or unfinished. Accuracy does not dismantle a living relationship into empty pieces. It helps distinguish what belongs to that relationship from what another person’s expectations added. Faith’s depth can be respected, critical questions retained and identical paths required of nobody. For the immediate undertaking, an honest description of accepted participation and its limits may suffice. Beyond that limit remain further reading, conversation, silence and a decision not yet made. Incompleteness does not render an existing relationship worthless, nor does it entitle either participant or interlocutor to announce the future answer as already known merely because one outcome would fit their preferred understanding of faith.

What this means in practice

If you wish to continue, choose a small question about participation or use the article’s invented scene. No personal account of faith or return to a difficult experience is required. Write three separate lines: a proposition accepted or still considered; someone or something trusted, with its particular scope; an action you are prepared to join. Supply no missing answer through guesswork. A line can remain open. Distinguish words expressing your decision from those introduced through others’ expectations. Judge yourself by no tally of completed lines and attribute no matching answer to someone merely because they participate beside you.

Next, select one matter needing explanation. What does a formula mean? How is the action ordered? Which promise follows from participation? Whose information or agreement is needed? Every question need not be asked immediately and no personal history need be disclosed. Where both sides welcome conversation, name a particular question and listen while retaining the possibility of disagreement. Learn conditions before making a promise; where already known, compare them with what you can actually accept. The decision may remain partial without explaining an entire life.

Finally, choose a small next step: read the identified passage, clarify a formula, agree a role, keep an accepted promise or continue no further yet. Check whether the step was misrepresented as complete assent, or someone’s help taken as an obligation to believe identically. This is voluntary editorial philosophical attention, not a test of a religion’s truth, spiritual diagnosis or established way to change an inward state. It replaces no necessary competent assistance and requires no enduring danger. An open question can be its ending; reading creates no duty to participate or report a result.

Key quotation

> *“faith without works is dead.”*

— James2:20, final clause before the question mark, King James Version. Closing presentation punctuation is editorial; the clause retains the chapter’s Christian context.

Connections between traditions

1. **Assent without complete sight: Aquinas and William James.** In Summa Theologiae II–II, question2, article1, Aquinas distinguishes faith, knowledge and opinion; in The Will to Believe I and IV, James considers decision under a particular combination of conditions. The limited resemblance is that assent is not always described as the outcome of a completed demonstration. Aquinas's theological definition of faith's act, however, differs from James's defence of deciding a living, forced and momentous option. Neither comparison turns every wish into truth or warrants abandoning examination of available evidence.

2. **Faith's object and direction: Aquinas and Hebrews11.** In question2, article2, Aquinas distinguishes relations of one act of faith to God as object, ground of assent and end; Hebrews11:1–16 connects faith with hope and the awaited promise. The limited resemblance is a particular religious direction rather than trust without an object. The difference is between theological analysis of one act and a narrative of examples of faith. Our working distinction between conviction, trust and participation is editorial: it neither translates Aquinas's three terms nor classifies every religion.

3. **Action and faith: James2 and Hebrews11.** James2:14–17 tests words about faith through help for someone lacking clothing and food; Hebrews11:8–10 recounts Abraham's action in faith and expectation. The limited resemblance concerns faith alongside a particular action rather than a spoken formula alone. But helping a person in need is not the same example as Abraham's calling, and both retain a Christian context. Participation in our shared undertaking therefore proves no complete assent, measures no salvation and supplies no grounds for demanding assistance at any cost.

4. **Acknowledging a proposition and a religious relationship: James2 and Aquinas.** James2:19 distinguishes acknowledging God's existence alone from the chapter's living connection of faith and works; Aquinas in question2, articles1–2, examines assent and the act of faith's direction. The limited resemblance is that naming a proposition someone accepts does not fully describe their religious relationship. James offers moral exhortation, Aquinas theological analysis. This comparison diagnoses no unbeliever, judges no person's sincerity by outward behaviour and makes no accepted useful role an assent to all a community's grounds.

5. **Awaiting a promise and awaiting evidence: Hebrews11 and James.** Hebrews11:35–40 includes suffering and a promise not received within a lifetime; James in VIII retains waiting for objective evidence where an option is not forced. The comparison distinguishes two kinds of waiting that cannot be reduced to confidence in quick success. The chapter's grounds concern religious faith and promise, James's the conditions of decision and risk of error. Waiting therefore proves no conviction's truth, and relinquishing a guarantee of worldly success requires neither inaction in danger nor refusal of necessary assistance.

Primary sources

1. Thomas Aquinas. Summa Theologiae II–II, question2, articles1–2; identified1920 English translation.

2. Complete Hebrews11, King James Version.

3. Complete James2, King James Version.

4. William James. The Will to Believe, sectionsI,IV,VIII; original English text,1912 impression.

Actual reading scopes are recorded in the notes. Russian quotations are United Wisdom translations from KJV; English literals were checked against that version. James was read in original English and Aquinas in the identified translation; Latin and Greek originals were not collated. Contemporary scenes and practice are editorial work with no established efficacy.

Tags

faith, trust, conviction, practice, truth, assent, participation, prayer, religion, theology, philosophy, meaning, hope, unseen, choice, uncertainty, question, testimony, promise, care, help, community, conversation, respect, agency, boundaries, experience, Aquinas, William James, Christianity

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.