

UNITED WISDOM

Meaning as experience, direction and narrative coherence

Meaning and Direction

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

P-01-N02 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Meaning as experience, direction and narrative coherence

Epigraph

> *At fifteen, I had my mind bent on learning.*

Confucius, AnalectsII.4, first sentence. James Legge translation. Text.

What this article is about

When someone says life has gained meaning, different changes may lie behind the phrase: a significant experience, a direction for participation or a clearer account of the past. They connect without replacing one another. This article distinguishes their questions while retaining value separately: a coherent story does not prove its outcome worthy of choice. A hypothetical occupational transition explores describing experience, deciding and clarifying biography without a demand for one final formula. Martela and Steger's conceptual article identifies psychological boundaries; ancient philosophical and religious texts retain their own grounds. There is no reader test, ideal balance or validated programme for gaining meaning. There is room to say more precisely what happened, what matters, how it is understood and what is proposed next, while leaving the unknown open.

I. One word can hide different questions

Someone says life has become more meaningful. What changed: a felt significance in today's event, a chosen direction, or a more intelligible account of the past? They may support one another, but none automatically confirms the rest. A vivid experience does not form a plan. A plan does not prove its goal's value. A coherent story does not guarantee a true explanation. Here felt meaning is considered as a language of experience, direction as a language of participation, and narrative coherence as a language of understanding. This is our editorial distinction among questions, not diagnosis or a claim that people contain precisely three measurable parts of meaning. Scientific and philosophical frames will be named separately without a concealed substitution.

Imagine someone learning a different occupation after many years in one field. They are not preparing a public success story, simply sorting documents and letters. One note calls the change a long-held wish. Another shows that keeping the previous job was initially preferred and the decision emerged later. This hypothetical scene is not memory research. A mismatch need not mean deception: understanding may have changed alongside the account. It

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

nevertheless offers a concrete question. What is known about the sequence, what matters today, and what is the person prepared to do next? Answers may differ without being immediately assembled into a beautiful final biography. Clarification begins with the records' content rather than a personality judgement.

Meaning should not be required to report everything at once. Someone can feel the value of new work without understanding its relation to the former occupation. They can explain the transition well without choosing a next step. Direction can be steady without an exceptional lift in mood. None is a diagnosis of insufficient meaning. These possibilities show why a particular question deserves its own answer. Feeling cannot replace records when facts are needed. An attractive account cannot remove conditions when choosing. A plan's detail does not establish value. Distinguishing questions permits a complex relation to life without making inner consistency a prerequisite for participation in one actual activity.

II. A scientific map is not an assessment of the reader

Martela and Steger's 2016 conceptual article distinguishes coherence, purpose and significance: intelligibility, direction in core goals and a sense of life's value. This concerns subjective psychological meaning, not the universe's ultimate ground. The authors identify open empirical questions; the distinction is not a ready test or a validated change programme. Our language of experience does not replace significance with a new official scale. The map clarifies questions while preserving the boundary between a research construct and an editorial exercise.

In the hypothetical occupational change, a map can pose questions without scoring the person's life. What became more understandable? Which next choice has an actual direction? Why does this activity seem worth participating in? The text should not grade the answers. One question may matter more today; another may lack words. An absent answer does not necessarily mean inability to answer. The topic's scale or missing information may matter, but the article does not determine causes for its reader. Application remains limited to naming a question without confusing it with another. There is no ideal balance, total score or promise that filling three cells sequentially will create a feeling of meaning.

Subjective as a research term must not become arbitrary. Describing how life is experienced differs from claiming every conclusion is automatically true. A transition story can be checked against facts, a goal discussed through its grounds, and participation considered through effects on others. Checking a fact gives no right to decide what another person must feel. Different questions require different discussion: one concerns a record, another a conviction, another an account of experience. When mixed, criticism of a date becomes rejection of an entire life's value, while vivid feeling supposedly excuses responding to an objection. Precision prevents both substitutions.

III. Experience need not be a constant signal

An event can seem significant before its place in life can be explained. Someone helps a colleague with a difficult task and notices that participation matters. This is not yet a final calling or proof that the new occupation will always suit them. The experience has a specific address and time, and can be acknowledged without being made constant. If tomorrow brings no similar feeling, yesterday has not disappeared. If the feeling persists, conditions still deserve discussion. This is a possible human account, not an established psychological mechanism. No desired experience is promised, and its absence is not evidence of a wrong choice or insufficient depth in the reader.

The hypothetical participant can record what mattered: intelligible help for someone, personal skill, learning, or an after-work conversation. These are different answers. Calling them all the meaning of the new profession erases detail. A further reasoning step is needed between an event and an entire field. One good encounter does not describe every condition; one disappointment does not remove every possibility. This is no demand to average good and bad experiences into a correct outcome. It concerns a statement’s scope. Experience can be taken seriously without being assigned the whole life’s decision. Sometimes it supplies another question rather than a final conclusion. A limited role does not automatically reduce its value.

Experience need not look the same to others. One person speaks quietly, another emotionally, and another declines public discussion. Presentation is not a validated measure of meaning. Persuasive speech need not precede a right to one’s own account. Nor does strong expression become final truth about events. A listener can hear experience and clarify facts separately where conversation requires. The participant may decline to turn an event into a general story. Here it can be a short private note rather than a presentation of a new path. It promises no clarity tomorrow and needs no audience approval to remain part of today’s experience.

IV. Direction is not merely a task list

A task list organises a day but does not explain why these tasks are chosen. Someone can plan another person’s expectation in detail while lacking their own relation to it. Direction can also exist before every action is known. In our scene, new work need not immediately become a sole destiny. A limited intention can be named: learn a useful skill, participate in a particular activity or retain an acceptable way to earn. Grounds can be discussed without elevating every practical choice to a mission. Here direction concerns a connection between stated grounds and offered participation. This editorial usage is no measure or promise that a detailed plan automatically produces significance.

Direction has conditions. Learning work requires time, information and available instruction. Commitments concern others. An existing skill does not cancel limits in health or demands.

This is neither financial, medical nor occupational advice; it shows why direction does not release facts from consideration. A goal can be accepted while its proposed form is rejected. Extent or timing can change while grounds remain. New information may lead to rejecting the goal. This is not necessarily inner inconsistency; a changed decision may answer changed conditions. It deserves discussion through content rather than an immediate verdict that someone failed to want strongly enough or describe a path attractively.

Direction can include several important relationships. Work, family, reading and rest need not compete as though only one may matter. Real conflicts in time or commitments can require choice, but do not prove that a whole life must have one summit. Our participant can learn new work while retaining former friendships without subordinating either. If conflict arises, it can be named: what timing and extent are actually possible? Meaning should not win the dispute for one side in advance. Each may have grounds and affected people. Considering these guarantees no easy decision, but avoids replacing decision with an attractive formula declaring everything consistent before encountering facts.

V. Narrative coherence need not conceal a break

A life account can reveal a sequence without establishing inevitability. If new work followed a difficult period, that whole period need not have existed for its sake. Conditions, decisions, chance encounters and unknown causes can be named separately. A letter in our scene shows initial preference for staying and a later changed decision. A coherent story can retain this turn instead of making early doubt a secret certainty. Clarification promises no relief or proof of biographical work’s efficacy. It concerns honesty in a particular narrative. An account can become more intelligible by naming a break rather than declaring every event part of one predetermined path.

Other people’s motives should not be appropriated for narrative beauty. A manager refused, a friend helped and a colleague did not reply, but each action’s meaning for its actor may remain unknown. The participant can describe its effect without claiming the other person’s entire inner history. The distinction gives others room. They need not perform as a test, rescuer or obstacle in someone else’s biography. When information is available and conversation appropriate, a fact can be clarified. Otherwise the unknown remains part of the account without automatically making it incoherent. Limits of knowledge prevent causality being invented merely because a reader or storyteller needs a convenient transition.

Every injury need not become a useful lesson. Learning something after an unfair event can coexist with regarding it as unfair. A later outcome does not automatically justify an earlier action. When biography requires every loss to be a good, coherence comes at the price of silencing actual objections. Our participant can welcome a new opportunity while retaining criticism of former conditions. Those relations are not contradictory by definition; they concern

different events and evaluations. This article cannot determine what happened in an unknown reader’s life. It preserves the distinction. A story can be discussed without making a beautiful final form compulsory proof of maturity, gratitude or a correct relation to the past.

VI. A convenient explanation does not prove value

How an activity emerged may be well understood while its worth remains a question. A clear goal can face substantial objections. Intelligibility explains connections without automatically justifying them. In the hypothetical transition, availability of a new role may be clear while its content and conditions still require acceptance. Lacking that decision is not necessarily failed coherence; it is a different question. Convictions, commitments, concrete usefulness and affected people can enter discussion. This article establishes no universal measure of value. It prevents a successful explanation taking every ground’s place, as though a clear sequence already proved each resulting outcome or intention right.

In the opening of Augustine’s Confessions, relation to God grounds search and rest, rather than merely making biography convenient. Aristotle’s Nicomachean Ethics I.7 considers human good through activity and a final end. Their grounds are not interchangeable. Both draw attention to a question coherence alone cannot settle: what is accepted as worthy? The theological and philosophical frames remain, without claiming either validates a modern exercise or describes the same psychological construct. Specific passages are used rather than complete expositions of the works.

Readers may have another ground or be unable to name one yet. Neither gives the article authority to determine life’s ultimate value for them. In our scene, the new occupation needs consideration of its own. A participant can say: I understand the transition but reject this condition. Or: I do not understand the whole history yet, but participation here matters. These statements need not become one rating. They make explanation, choice and conviction distinct. Agreement with others is not guaranteed. Yet a beautiful story need not be the price of a right to object, nor a clear experience a means of closing dispute about concrete conditions.

VII. Time is not a universal schedule for meaning

Analects II.4, in James Legge’s translation, describes learning and formation through stages of age. This normative Confucian account retains Heaven and propriety; it is not a psychological schedule for every modern person. The epigraph takes the passage’s first sentence. Its proximity to our example does not require learning new work by a particular age or losing doubts on schedule. The relevant question is how understanding develops over time, not transferring ancient markers into a table of personal success.

The participant may read a formerly clear letter differently today. That does not establish that the past was empty. A new question changes attention to detail, while the record still witnesses an earlier moment. It is possible to distinguish: I decided this then; I understand it differently now. The new version need not be final. Another year may bring information or relationships. Our editorial approach permits change alongside precision and responsibility: facts are not rewritten for convenience, while interpretation is named as interpretation. This promises no memory or health outcome. Understanding can continue without every new thought proving a previous life mistaken and a real one finally begun.

Understanding need not move at action’s pace. New work may already have begun while a transition story remains unfinished. Or earlier events are being understood while the former role continues. Both situations have real conditions unknown to this article. Speed in producing a persuasive story cannot judge them alone. Sometimes action needs an answer before the larger question; sometimes delay permits important information. This recommends neither waiting nor rushing universally. It declines to impose one pace. A near deadline can be discussed separately from long understanding of life. Today’s agreement then need not answer for an entire biography, and an unfinished account need not prohibit a concrete decision.

VIII. A shared account does not remove one’s own response

Other people belong to a story without necessarily knowing its entire meaning for its subject. A friend may recall a fact differently, a colleague see another motive, or a relative value another outcome. Their accounts deserve consideration without automatically replacing one’s relation to events. A date or decision can be asked about where conversation is appropriate. A factual correction can be accepted while its significance is understood differently. Some experience may remain private. This guarantees neither reconciliation nor meaning. It distinguishes roles: a witness helps with what was seen, a partner offers understanding, and a person continues answering for conclusions without making them someone else’s compulsory agreement.

Another person need not become confirmation of a path. When new work is said to give relationships meaning, a relative may disagree with the formula. They have their own experience and conditions. Conversation requires no single final biography. Agreeing on a time, task allocation or way of communicating may suffice. That agreement is limited but real; inner grounds need not coincide. Disagreement about the larger account does not automatically cancel all shared life. A dispute may concern a fact, an evaluation, or a proposal requiring another person’s reply. No map of meaning may name that reply right or wrong in advance for the participants.

If an account concerns a severe event or a specific professional problem, a simple exercise cannot replace needed help. This does not make every unfinished explanation a sign of illness.

A complicated story cannot diagnose someone. Yet independent coherence must not be demanded where concrete support is needed. The situation matters more than narrative beauty. In ordinary conversation, one may clarify a fact while declining to discuss everything. That boundary does not make participation unreal; it states the available extent of contact. Meaning becomes no duty to give others complete access to one’s life, and autonomy no prohibition on requesting help.

IX. Different questions can remain open differently

The hypothetical participant receives no perfect life map. Part of the former account needs correction. One present event matters. A limited intention to continue learning exists, while ultimate grounds and future conditions remain unknown. The parts need not have identical status. A fact can be clarified, a conviction discussed, action offered and experience described. An unanswered question does not automatically remove every other answer. Separation guarantees no calm but makes conversation more precise. The alternatives are not a beautiful complete story or a claim that nothing matters. An unfinished account can retain reliable information, actual evaluations and a person’s right to continue understanding.

Felt meaning, direction and narrative coherence help discuss adjacent aspects when none must answer for everything. Value remains a distinct question rather than dissolving into an account’s convenience. The scientific map stays within subjective, conceptual limits. Philosophical and religious texts retain different grounds. Our example proves neither them nor the exercise’s efficacy. It offers a possible grammar: this happened; this matters to me; this is my present understanding; this is proposed next. Disagreement may remain between sentences without being decorated immediately as unity. An honest account sometimes begins by acknowledging which connections are actually seen and which are still being sought.

A person may revise an explanation, decline a direction and report no constant significance. These rights do not remove facts or relations with others, but require no finished biography as admission to life. Today’s activity can have a named ground while the larger account remains open. A conversation can clarify a record without resolving the world. An unknown question can remain unknown without judging everything else. This scale need not suit every reader or become the only correct form. It leaves room for one’s response: distinguish experience from proof, a plan from value and coherence from final truth, while preserving actual participation without promising a fully intelligible life.

What this means in practice

Choose one event you currently connect with meaning in life. This editorial exercise concerns language and scale, not a psychological measure or validated method. Write four short statements: what is known about the event; what seems significant; how its relation to other events is understood now; and which further participation you are prepared to offer. Equal certainty is not required. One answer may be unknown.

Separate fact from interpretation. If a letter or agreement differs from the current account, the whole account need not be rejected. Clarify the particular part: I wanted this then; the decision changed later. Do not invent others' motives for a convenient transition; they may be unknown. An unfair event need not become a good because an opportunity later arose.

Ask separately about the value of participation, rather than the story's intelligibility. Are its grounds and actual conditions acceptable? Clarification, a small step, refusal or time to answer may be selected. None guarantees a desired feeling. The entire biography need not be explained publicly. Appropriate support is not replaced where needed. A possible outcome is modest: one question has its own address, and the story retains facts alongside the right to revise understanding.

Key quotation

> *our hearts are restless until they rest in You.*

Augustine, ConfessionsI.1, exact sentence fragment. J.G.Pilkington translation, electronic revision by Kevin Knight. Text.

Connections between traditions

Similar questions do not establish identical grounds.

Distinction	Comparison	Boundary
Intelligibility and value	Martela–Steger; editorial story	A conceptual map does not assess the reader.
Time and formation	AnalectsII.4; changed work	The age narrative is no universal schedule.
Rest and relationship	Augustine; value	Christian grounds are not replaced with psychology.
End and activity	Aristotle; participation	Normative good is not reduced to feeling.

Distinction	Comparison	Boundary
Account and decision	Four frames; exercise	Sources did not validate the exercise’s efficacy.

Primary sources

1. Martela & Steger,2016, The three meanings of meaning in life, DOI10.1080/17439760.2015.1137623. Selected definitions and cautions read; no scale or table reproduced.

2. Confucius, AnalectsII.4. James Legge; epigraph is the first sentence.

3. Augustine, ConfessionsI.1. J.G.Pilkington, revision by Kevin Knight; key quotation is an exact sentence fragment.

4. Aristotle, Nicomachean EthicsI.7. W.D.Ross; bounded normative comparison.

Russian quotations are original United Wisdom translations from the named English editions. Story and exercise are editorial examples.

Tags

meaning, experience, direction, coherence, story, value, understanding, choice, participation, biography, fact, interpretation, purpose, plan, time, formation, unknown, memory, relationships, boundaries, autonomy, psychology, philosophy, religion, Confucius, Augustine, Aristotle, Martela, Steger, significance

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.