

UNITED WISDOM

Spiritual explanations and practical responsibilities

Meaning and Direction

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

P16 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Spiritual explanations and practical responsibilities

Epigraph

“faith, if it hath not works, is dead, being alone.”

— James 2:17, clause following “Even so”, King James Version; original lower-case beginning retained.

What this article is about

A spiritual explanation can support someone facing a difficult task: help them bear uncertainty, loosen the need to win an argument, or recognise the significance of care. It can also take the task's place. After a conversation about acceptance, an unsent message, an unsettled agreement and someone unsure what to expect may remain. The difference appears neither in elevated language nor in an experience's presumed depth, but in what has become available for discussion and action. This essay follows an invented everyday scene and compares limited passages from James, the Bhagavad-Gita and Marcus Aurelius. Their religious and philosophical grounds remain different; they provide no common spirituality score. We distinguish a framework of meaning from a factual explanation, freely undertaken responsibility from another person's demand, and a useful pause from an indefinite disappearance. Reading can end without an exercise: the essay offers no final judgement of anyone's inward life.

I. The message that remains unsent

Imagine two adults sharing a small workshop. A window leaks, and they agreed to notify the person responsible for the premises. One neighbour offered to write the message before Friday; the other would supply photographs. The pictures are ready, but the message remains unsent. Asked about timing, the first neighbour says that they are learning to accept the world's imperfections and do not want to act from irritation. This is an invented scene, not an account of a particular person or a studied behavioural type. We know only the agreed task, the missed deadline and the words spoken. We do not know the neighbour's circumstances, capacity, other difficulties, or whether they have actually withdrawn their promise.

With knowledge this limited, two opposite conclusions are tempting. The neighbour might be declared spiritually immature because the message is unfinished. Alternatively, their withdrawal might be called a higher state, making another question seem petty. Both

conclusions add something the scene does not establish. An absent message reveals no entire inward life; an elevated explanation does not determine who will complete the shared task. A more precise conversation begins with its subject: does the earlier agreement stand, is another deadline needed, or could the other person take over? These questions require neither ridicule of spirituality nor agreement with a particular interpretation. They leave room for circumstances that have not yet been described.

The scale matters. This essay does not decide legal responsibility for the repair or offer a method of establishing enforceable obligations in a dispute. It considers an ordinary promise within an invented scene. If no agreement existed, or the task was different, the starting account would need correction. If the neighbour cannot currently write, that also changes the conversation. Checking a fact does not require someone to overcome every difficulty. Yet unknown circumstances do not make the task complete. Between accusation and exoneration lies a substantial possibility: clarify what is known, allow the account to change, and identify what neither participant yet knows about the situation.

II. Meaning and explanations of an event

When someone says a difficulty taught them patience, they may be describing their understanding of what happened. An outside observer need not be able to confirm that understanding's entire depth. But it does not follow that the window leaks for a particular lesson, or that the neighbour must participate in that lesson. Personal significance and a claim about an event's cause have different subjects. In our example, someone can acknowledge how the speaker understands the situation without treating that account as an established description of the world. Respect for a person permits questions about facts. It need not be purchased by giving up the possibility of checking a particular agreement.

This distinction is especially useful when one sentence quietly performs several tasks. An account of acceptance might express an inward intention, request more time, and propose abandoning the repair all at once. The listener need not guess which purpose matters most. They can ask separately whether a pause is needed and whether the message is still planned. The answer may be straightforward: the neighbour hopes to write tomorrow, when they can choose calmer words. Or they may have changed their mind about participating. Neither answer requires an overall judgement about faith. Both make it possible to consider the next agreement without treating an ambiguous sentence as consent to everything it might imply.

If an explanation assists action, its usefulness appears in a particular relationship to the task. After a pause, there might be a clearer message, a request for help, or an honest notice of withdrawal. This does not prove a spiritual teaching true: that question requires other grounds and may remain open. Conversely, a poorly worded message does not refute an entire tradition. We retain a more modest question: did this understanding help someone describe the

actual situation and an available response? At that scale, meaning retains its place, and the neighbour need not become a judge of another person's spiritual path. Practical clarity and doctrinal assent can be considered separately.

III. Blessing and a material need

James 2:14–18 places a need for clothing and food within its discussion of faith and works. The passage retains a Christian question about faith; it is not a neutral experiment measuring the usefulness of kind language. Its limited relevance here lies in distinguishing a spoken wish from supplying something needed. Placing these alongside each other does not make every good word empty. Encouragement can have its own value. But where assistance has a particular object, a word's value does not automatically make that object available. We use this bounded comparison rather than turn a theological claim into an assessment of a contemporary reader's faith or personal worth.

In the everyday scene, this distinction returns us to the message. A calmer relationship to the leaking window and contacting the person responsible can coexist. One concerns how someone experiences the inconvenience; the other provides information to someone who can address it. Even if the message leads to no repair, it has a specific object: convey an account and photographs, and request a response. The sender does not control the whole outcome. Yet that limit does not make the difference between a sent and an unsent message irrelevant. For the other participant, these are different states of a shared task, not merely different shades of the first neighbour's inward feeling.

There is an opposite danger too. A passage about works could be used to demand endless assistance and treat every limit as a failure of faith. This essay derives no such authority from the selected passage. One person's need deserves attention, while another person's actual capacity remains a separate question. Asking about timing in our scene differs from demanding that someone never rest. Declining, being unable, and breaking a promise are also different matters. Clarifying these distinctions does not dismiss help. It allows discussion of its object without replacing that discussion with spiritual superiority or an assumed right to direct another person's whole life.

IV. Detachment does not complete a task

At the beginning of the Bhagavad-Gita's third chapter, Arjuna asks about contemplation and action; Krishna answers within a religious conversation about an appointed task. We read Edwin Arnold's particular English poetic translation, without collating Sanskrit or treating it as a neutral account of every school. The selected passage connects action with one's relationship to desired gain. It offers our scene a limited distinction: dependence on one hoped-for outcome can be loosened while the task itself remains. The text retains its own grounds. Our neighbour does not become Arjuna, and ordinary correspondence does not become a divinely prescribed battle. The comparison neither assigns a religious role nor settles the broader problem of justified action.

A message can be written without certainty that its recipient will agree immediately. A response can be requested without making it the condition of the sender's worth. Yet detachment from success need not mean indifference to what the message says. A wrong address, missing photographs or an unclear description still matters to the task. Attention to means can therefore coexist with recognising limits of control. This position promises no special calm: someone may continue to feel anxious. What matters here is more specific. Lack of a guaranteed outcome is not treated as proof that an available action is useless, while undertaking that action is not made equivalent to overcoming every circumstance or securing the desired response.

An appointed task in a historical religious text and a freely undertaken contemporary promise have different grounds. Their comparison does not establish that every demand from a relative, colleague or teacher has become one's duty. That is why a question about an actual agreement precedes a question about its completion. If the neighbour never agreed to write, elevated reasoning cannot create consent retrospectively. If they did agree, changed conditions can be clarified. If the shared task has become unacceptable, its subject needs a different conversation. Reference to a tradition does not remove the participants' need to check which action they are discussing and why they assign it to a particular person.

V. Human work and room for rest

In Meditations V.1, Marcus Aurelius addresses himself when reluctant to rise. In the edited Meric Casaubon translation, the reflection concerns human nature and the common good; the same section recognises a need for rest. This is Stoic self-address, not sleep research or a prescription for someone whose capacities are unknown. We borrow no standard of permissible tiredness from it. The bounded comparison concerns a relationship between inward reflection and a task. Reflection may return attention to action without becoming a demand imposed on another person's body. The philosophical source retains its subject, and the contemporary scene gains no false medical foundation or universal timetable from it.

Our neighbour may need a pause, and that possibility should not be dismissed in advance as an excuse. The question is whether the pause can be described so that the other participant is not left with an inaccurate expectation. Sometimes a brief message saying the original deadline no longer works is enough. Sometimes even that response is unavailable for now, and silence alone cannot establish a spiritual cause. Where discussion is possible, however, specific information helps more than an announcement that time is relative. Rest has significance of its own. It does not require an elevated story before it can become the subject of a respectful conversation.

This also prevents a competition in productivity. The second participant might write faster, but speed establishes no superiority of their spiritual path. The first might be calmer about uncertainty, but calm does not transfer the task without agreement. Each capacity has a limited subject. When capacities become an overall ranking of people, useful distinctions disappear. Rather than select the most mature participant, the neighbours can consider who can presently do a particular piece of work and how to change its allocation honestly. Help then need not become punishment for weakness, and rest does not require describing an unfinished task as if it were already resolved.

VI. Acceptance and agreement answer different questions

Accepting an inconvenience may mean ceasing to deny that the window leaks. Agreeing to do nothing is a separate decision; no necessary transition connects them. Likewise, wanting not to act from anger need not mean that a message must await anger's complete disappearance. Someone may choose an acceptable form of action while their inward state remains imperfect. This essay does not promise that such a choice is always easy or available. It simply does not make a desired purity of feeling into a universal entrance requirement for an ordinary task. Sometimes a considerate action begins by acknowledging one's limits, rather than by finally overcoming them or achieving a completely settled state.

Language about acceptance can also request that a conversation not be intensified immediately. That request can be heard at its own scale without accepting all the speaker's explanations along with it. The neighbours might postpone a dispute about meaning while retaining a brief discussion of who will send the message. This is not a concealed technique for managing another person. It makes sense only where participation is voluntary and conversation is actually possible. If someone does not want to discuss their spiritual biography, an everyday clarification must not become a roundabout way of extracting it. The message's practical subject and personal faith can remain distinct even when one participant experiences a connection between them.

There are situations in which no pause can be agreed. One person may regard every question as a disturbance of their peace; the other may regard every silence as disrespect. This essay offers no formula guaranteed to reconcile them. A distinction can still be kept between one's own decision and another person's response: communicate an available fact, decline an unsuitable task, or clarify a limit on conversation. Appreciation in return is not assured. That uncertainty does not require a judgement about the person's spirituality. An unsuccessful conversation can remain an unsuccessful conversation. It need not become evidence that one worldview is generally superior or that the other participant's inward experience has no value.

VII. Responsibility needs a specific ground

Everything expected of someone is sometimes called a real obligation. Yet an expectation differs from an undertaking. A neighbour may want the other person always to handle unpleasant conversations; that does not establish such an agreement. Kinship, previous assistance or participation in the same circle likewise gives this essay no ground for automatically assigning every task to someone. Responsibility in our example is discussed because a particular voluntary response to a particular request has been specified. If that fact is contested, it needs clarification. A conversation about spiritual explanations should not quietly expand the list of demands or make human relationships equivalent to indefinitely servicing another person's expectations.

Even an undertaken task may need reconsideration. It may prove much more demanding than described, circumstances may change, or an unacceptable way of completing it may emerge. An honest account of such a change differs from completion, but preserves the possibility of a real conversation. There is no need to prove that an earlier promise never existed in order to ask for it to change. Nor need a personal decision be announced as a higher spiritual law that the other participant must acknowledge. A smaller ground is often clearer: I agreed, I now cannot or do not want to continue in this form, and we need to consider how that affects the shared task.

The essay's own boundary matters here. It does not determine which promises remain binding under every threat, or require someone to stay in danger for moral consistency. The invented scene contains no danger; different circumstances need their own assessment. Necessary assistance is not replaced by a philosophical exercise. Our subject is precision in ordinary speech and the allocation of available actions, rather than every ground of duty. This boundary retains the person's agency and other participants' ability to understand what is happening to a shared undertaking. It gives those participants no compulsory access to someone's inward life, and creates no requirement to reveal private convictions to justify every practical limit.

VIII. A conversation without a spiritual examination

Return to the workshop. The second neighbour can say the photographs are ready and they need to know who will send the message. This keeps the conversation's subject intact without asking how sincerely the first neighbour accepts the world. If a reflection on inevitable change follows, its personal significance can be acknowledged while the practical question is clarified again. Such acknowledgement must not become a tactic involving false assent to something the listener does not accept. It is enough to say honestly that the matter of meaning has been heard, while the shared task's state remains unknown. Participants need no common worldview to distinguish prepared pictures from a message that has been sent.

The first neighbour can distinguish a request from an interpretation too. They may say they are not ready for conversation today, and explain what that means for the message if they can make that clarification. They may ask the other person to send it or suggest another deadline. The second participant remains free to decline the new allocation. One person's freedom does not make another a replacement worker by default. Here respectful language meets specificity: nobody must acknowledge someone else's spiritual explanation as true, while each can describe their own participation as clearly as their actual circumstances permit. Requests then remain requests rather than becoming undisclosed transfers of responsibility.

Clarity does not always require a long explanation. A detailed account of inward work can sometimes overload a conversation and make a simple question harder. Someone can report that a message is unsent without confessing their entire life. They can mention tiredness without establishing moral blamelessness. If both participants wish to discuss the event's significance, that is an acceptable separate subject too. This essay imposes no order requiring every spiritual word to be immediately translated into a task list. It proposes retaining different subjects, so that a voluntary conversation about meaning does not quietly stand in for an answer to a practical question that has still not been answered.

IX. Repair does not require a new story

Suppose the message is eventually sent on Monday. This does not establish that the earlier explanation was knowingly deceptive or that the neighbour has completed a spiritual stage. We know only that the task's state has changed. Attention to that small fact protects both participants from additional conclusions. One receives relevant information; the other need not accompany every action with a new account of transformation. If the missed deadline caused inconvenience, that can be acknowledged separately. Acknowledgement does not make the whole person guilty, and later action does not automatically erase every consequence of delay. Both the change and what actually preceded it remain available for discussion without becoming an entire moral biography.

Another outcome is possible: the first neighbour declines, the second sends the message, and they alter future agreements. This need not mean the relationship has ended or one person has defeated the other. The change should nevertheless be named, or the earlier pattern of expectations may continue. If one person quietly completes the task while the other believes it has disappeared, they inhabit different accounts of the shared situation. New clarity may be small: who handled the present work, and what each is willing to undertake next. That information explains no entire emotional history, but it does not require such a history to be fully explained before altered participation can be acknowledged.

What was valuable in the earlier explanation can be retained too. Perhaps the first neighbour recognised that harsh messages do not suit them and now requests time to choose words. This limited self-understanding need not become a rule for everyone. The second neighbour might clarify deadlines earlier without labelling every delay a spiritual evasion of responsibility. Work on meaning remains open while an everyday agreement becomes more precise. Development here requires no compulsory success story. A result may simply be that both sides assign fewer intentions to each other and distinguish their own intentions, facts concerning the shared task, and questions to which they still have no answer.

X. Elevated language and ordinary clarity

We therefore need no list of words that reliably detects withdrawal from action. Acceptance, trust and detachment do not establish a substitution by themselves. Their significance depends on what someone is trying to communicate and how it relates to the task being discussed. Plain speech can conceal a promise too, while a complex spiritual account may honestly describe a real difficulty. A question about the connection is therefore more useful than classifying vocabulary. After the explanation, is it clearer what happened, what the person requests, and what changed in participation? Or have those very questions remained unanswered while the listener is asked to regard them as settled?

This question grants no right to inspect another person's soul. It remains within a situation in which the questioner participates. They may need to know whether someone will attend a meeting, send a message, or continue a task they undertook. That need does not confer authority to determine another person's faith's truth or demand inward acknowledgement. The boundary works both ways. Someone offering a spiritual framework cannot declare every disagreement a sign of the listener's spiritual blindness. A shared subject can be discussed while convictions remain different. Where that proves impossible, the conversation's limits can be acknowledged rather than trying to force a conclusive exchange or claim agreement that has not occurred.

Meaning can support ordinary clarity: help someone avoid humiliating language, notice limits of control, or report a change in capacity honestly. It should not be counted in advance as an action already completed. This small boundary retains the value of inward searching and consideration for those involved in a shared task. It promises neither flawless communication nor constant self-analysis. Sometimes one clarification is enough; sometimes an agreement needs revision; sometimes someone chooses not to continue. What matters is that the choice and its practical consequences remain available for honest description. An explanation's elevated character need not close a question before an actual answer has become available to the participants.

What this means in practice

If you wish to continue, choose a small, ordinary situation: the essay's invented message, or an agreement comfortable to consider. No difficult recollection, disclosure of convictions or inspection of another person's spirituality is required. First name a known fact without explaining its higher purpose. Separately record your understanding, if it matters. The two records need not be connected by a claim of cause. A question can stay open, and no tradition has to be selected as a compulsory answer.

Clarify whether an actual voluntary promise exists. If it does, describe its subject as specifically as possible: what was expected, who knows about it, and whether circumstances have changed. Another person's expectation need not automatically count as consent. Then consider which response is available now. It may be an action, a request for time, a different allocation, or notice of withdrawal. This list supplies no mandatory sequence and settles no entire question of duty. Avoid choosing an action that requires disregarding danger or necessary assistance.

If wanted, formulate one short clarification for conversation. Let it communicate the shared task's state rather than assess another person's inward life. The listener remains free to answer differently, decline the suggestion or refuse the conversation; agreement is not guaranteed. Respect for a person need not pretend assent to their explanation, and no proof of

spiritual maturity is required. A private record can be enough, or reading can end now. This is a voluntary editorial exercise in philosophical attention, with no established efficacy. It is neither diagnosis nor a spiritual examination, and replaces no necessary support. The final decision remains the person's.

Key quotation

> *“Work is more excellent than idleness;”*

— Bhagavad-Gita, chapter III, Krishna's opening reply, Edwin Arnold translation, 1900 edition. Source semicolon retained.

Connections between traditions

These rows compare particular Christian, Hindu and Stoic texts. Resemblance in a limited question establishes no common religion or identical ground of duty.

Both textual bases and concepts	Thematic mechanism, difference and limit
Speaking and doing. James 2:15–16: a wish and clothing/food. Gita III, Krishna's opening reply through the discussion of heavenly purpose: refraining from action and an appointed task.	A Christian argument about faith and Krishna's religious counsel connect inward position with action on different grounds. In our scene this distinguishes the neighbour's explanation from the message's state: the account can be heard while the practical question remains. The resemblance is confined to that connection. The texts prove neither each other true nor the message a religious duty, and reveal no reason for a particular person's delay.
A framework and a task's ground. Gita III, the same opening reply: appointed action. Marcus Aurelius V.1: human nature and the common good.	The Gita retains religious counsel within dialogue; Marcus retains Stoic self-address. Both allow a question about understanding's relationship to a task; a contemporary promise's ground still needs separate clarification. This comparison makes no expectation an automatic obligation, equates neither Stoic nature with Krishna's will, and authorises no imposition of a tradition on another participant.

Both textual bases and concepts	Thematic mechanism, difference and limit
Need and capacity. James 2:15–16: a particular material need. Marcus Aurelius V.1: work and acknowledged rest.	One passage keeps assistance's object visible; the other includes rest within its reflection on action. The editorial comparison preserves both an existing task and a question about a participant's capacity. Their different grounds become no common productivity standard. This row establishes no permissible tiredness or medical conclusion and authorises no demand for endless help as proof of faith.
A task's orientation and outcome. Gita III, opening reply at the discussion of acting without sought gain: action without sought gain. James 2:16–18: works presented as action.	The limited comparison distinguishes inward orientation from an action's occurrence: a message may be sent without a guaranteed answer, while goodwill alone reports no dispatch. Krishna and James retain different religious questions. This row equates no doctrines of salvation, establishes no efficacy for detachment, and makes success no compulsory outward indicator of personal spirituality.
Self-address and addressing another. Marcus Aurelius V.1: a reminder to himself. Gita III, Arjuna's question and Krishna's opening reply: instructive dialogue.	The genres differ: personal Stoic reflection is not a religious teacher's address. Their comparison draws attention to who is addressed in an everyday exchange: what someone tells themselves about a task becomes no command to a neighbour. It transfers neither Krishna's nor an emperor's authority to a contemporary participant, treats no historical role as a free present agreement, and requires no spiritual examination before discussing the message.
Language's own limit. James 2:16: a spoken wish. Marcus Aurelius V.1: reflection before a task.	In one passage speech is placed beside material assistance; in the other reflection points towards the author's own action. The limited resemblance allows words to retain their significance without counting a shared task complete. This is an editorial distinction within the invented scene. It declares neither spiritual language always useless nor a speaker insincere, and makes these different sources no universal causal theory of behaviour.

Primary sources

1. Complete James 2:14–18, King James Version.

2. Bhagavad-Gita III: Arjuna's question and Krishna's opening reply through “heavenly purpose”; Edwin Arnold, 1900 edition.

3. Marcus Aurelius, complete Meditations V.1; edited Meric Casaubon translation.

Russian quotations are United Wisdom translations from the named English editions; English literals were checked against them. Marcus is compared without literal quotation. Sanskrit and Greek were not collated. Actual reading scopes and limits are recorded in research notes. The contemporary scene, its reasoning and voluntary exercise are editorial; the exercise has no established efficacy.

Tags

spirituality, meaning, explanation, responsibility, promise, action, acceptance, assent, detachment, attention, conversation, message, agreement, assistance, rest, pause, boundaries, freedom, faith, works, James, Bhagavad-Gita, Krishna, Arjuna, Marcus Aurelius, Stoicism, traditions, practice, agency, clarity

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.