

UNITED WISDOM

Faith without certainty

Meaning and Direction

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

P-05-N01 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Faith without certainty

Epigraph

> *“Lord, I believe; help thou mine unbelief.”*

— Mark 9:24, the father’s address to Jesus, King James Version. The religious addressee remains; no reader’s healing outcome is promised.

What this article is about

An important proposition can be accepted without its grounds being regarded as final. A word may remain unclear, a former calm feeling absent or the content itself unanswered. These positions differ, and a sweeping judgement about oneself can hide their differences. We consider faith without certainty through an invented scene of an adult returning to a familiar religious text. Selected passages from William James, Pascal and the Gospel according to Mark serve as limited interlocutors while retaining distinct grounds and contexts. No religious answer is proved and no test of a true believer established. The contemporary scene and practice are original editorial work. Accurately naming a question, honest speech, participation’s conditions and immediate action without invented completeness remain central. Uncertainty is pronounced neither personal deficiency nor a required stage towards a predetermined outcome.

I. Uncertainty does not always concern the same thing

Imagine an adult returning to a familiar religious text and noticing that words long spoken no longer describe a relationship they can call unquestionable. They need not be rejecting everything previously important. A particular expression may be unclear, its grounds may have become questionable, or a familiar feeling of certainty may have weakened. In our invented scene, the person first wishes to distinguish these possibilities rather than reach a sweeping conclusion about an entire life. This is no report of an established case. Its question is simple: what is currently unclear, and why does the answer not yet constitute a final judgement on the presence or absence of faith?

Uncertainty about a proposition’s truth, not knowing a word’s meaning and lacking a familiar experience are different descriptions. Confusing them can lead to seeking proof where an explanation is needed first, or demanding vivid feeling instead of an answer about content. A question need not be immediately answerable to remain meaningful. Someone can say: this thought is accepted, this expression needs clarification, these grounds are not yet understood. Several such statements provide more information than a general verdict that something must

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

be wrong with the person. They prescribe no required progression towards faith. They return reflection to an object that can be considered without immediately passing final judgement on someone’s identity and previous participation, as though every uncertainty had already invalidated everything preceding it.

Clarification also distinguishes an open question from settled denial. Not knowing does not equal asserting impossibility; believing a statement mistaken need not be concealed behind polite uncertainty. Accuracy preserves both possibilities. Doubt need not entail compulsory rejection, and refusal need not pretend that assent exists. Faith without certainty can be someone’s real question, but every uncertainty is not pronounced faith here. A name needs a relationship to content, rather than merely a convenient position between answers. The name can remain undecided while a particular thought is clarified. A pause then has its own object, instead of becoming a promise to arrive at the outcome others already expect and treating their expectation as evidence of what must be happening inwardly.

II. Taking something as true differs from feeling unquestionable certainty

In section V of The Will to Believe, William James distinguishes knowing from knowing with certainty that we know. He contrasts specified empiricist and absolutist positions while retaining truth as a concern, rather than declaring every opinion equal. This is philosophical debate, not modern research on religious experience. Our comparison takes a limited distinction and proves no faith through it. Someone can accept a proposition without regarding their grounds as final; the availability of that description does not establish every accepted proposition as true. We ask how assent and the limits of one’s knowledge can be named accurately, without exchanging one for the other to secure a calmer or more persuasive personal account that seems to have resolved the question simply by changing its words.

In our scene, the person remembers why the text matters while questioning an earlier explanation. That explanation can be reconsidered without presenting the change as the disappearance of every relationship. Accepted content can remain while its earlier justification is questioned. Sometimes the content itself is no longer accepted; that change should not be hidden to preserve a former image. Distinguishing these matters resolves nothing automatically. It asks what remains, what changed and what lacks an answer. One crack need not be projected onto the entire building, while a real crack should not be covered by an attractive word. Conviction’s seriousness survives accuracy; accuracy permits conversation about its actual condition, rather than a convenient encompassing picture which keeps either asserting total stability or announcing complete collapse without looking closely.

Assent need not be tested every morning. Such testing can itself become attention’s sole object and obscure the content that prompted the question. Sometimes a selected passage can be read quietly, an unfamiliar term named or an interlocutor’s reasoned answer heard. Sometimes the question cannot yet be clarified and remains open. No step is promised to restore certainty here. Its significance lies in an honest relationship to the object, rather than a guaranteed experience after completion. New grounds can be accepted if sufficient for the person; where they are not, no failure need be declared simply because an expected answer did not arrive on schedule or resemble the old familiar feeling. The question’s substance and a hoped-for inward result remain separate matters in that consideration.

III. An address can name its own incompleteness

In Mark 9:14–29, a father addresses Jesus, joining a profession of belief with a request for help with unbelief. This is religious narrative about a spirit’s expulsion and a child’s healing, not a modern medical account. Its addressee and context remain; the quotation promises no healing, supplies no diagnosis and recommends no replacing assistance with prayer. Our limited comparison concerns an address’s form: a request need not perform a completeness the speaker cannot claim. The contemporary question remains different. This establishes neither every doubt as faith nor the narrative’s outcome as a prediction for a reader’s personal address, whose result belongs to another particular life and circumstances which neither a citation nor an author can determine beforehand.

Our invented person wishes to pray but is unsure whether every formula can be honestly repeated. The chosen text’s meaning and participation’s conditions can first be clarified. Where the address uses their own words, acknowledged incompleteness may belong to it: they wish to trust but cannot currently call that trust complete. This form is not pronounced permissible in every tradition or supplied as an established rite. It is someone’s question about their speech, which may need a competent interlocutor within a specified tradition. Uncertainty should not be concealed by another’s beautiful formula, and willingness to ask should not become a claim to know an outcome the person does not possess. The address can thus remain accurate about its speaker without undertaking to settle the whole religious question.

A request also differs from demanding immediate confirmation that one’s faith is correct. An answer may be desired; that desire authorises no promise here, and an expected event’s absence proves no personal deficiency. Where difficulty concerns health, safety or another field, necessary assistance has its own grounds and does not depend on an achieved intensity of conviction. Religious narrative does not erase that distinction in this article. Speech and relationship are considered, not ways of controlling events. Address, a question and available action can coexist without becoming competitors. A practice can also be declined where unwelcome; understanding a reading does not require saying a prayer to demonstrate that the

reader understood the quoted narrative and adopted a conclusion someone else wishes to demand from it.

IV. A question needs an object, not a verdict on a person

When someone says they doubt, an interlocutor may defend an entire system of convictions at once. Yet the question could concern one formula’s meaning, a historical explanation, a particular reason or why an action is considered obligatory. Its actual object deserves to be heard before an answer is offered. Our invented adult reader asks what a promise in a familiar text means. They are not yet requesting proof of the whole religion or proposing its abandonment. An expansive answer to another question may leave the original difficulty unintelligible. Clarification diminishes no seriousness of faith; it helps conversation retain the person among prepared responses. A word’s meaning can be asked about without publicly recounting an entire inward life or agreeing that one uncertainty already explains that life completely and permits someone else to pronounce upon it.

A question’s object also limits its possible answer. A word’s meaning may sometimes be clarified through its use in the selected text. A historical claim needs relevant information. Personal trust is not established through a dictionary entry alone, and a philosophical reason becomes no more compelling merely because a respected speaker offers it. These distinctions make no universal religious handbook. They belong to our editorial examination and show why one mode of answering replaces no others automatically. An explanation of meaning can be accepted while a question about grounds continues. A particular fact can be acknowledged without accepting a broader inference. Conversation then proceeds through small but real steps, which require neither declarations of complete victory nor announcements of final failure simply because everything was not settled simultaneously or an inward certainty did not immediately follow.

What remains unanswered can also be identified. A competent interlocutor need not possess a final solution to every question; competence abolishes no limit. An absent answer should not be replaced by a demand to stop asking. Yet an open question grants no right to demand another’s attention endlessly. Conversation requires agreement, time and a comprehensible boundary. Sometimes the next passage to read and question to revisit can be agreed; sometimes differing positions need acknowledgement without further persuasion. That outcome measures neither participant’s worth. It keeps room for honest not-knowing and permits a meeting to end without presenting its end as the end of a question each person may continue considering under their own circumstances. Neither endless discussion nor immediate agreement is made the necessary proof that the meeting mattered.

V. Grounds should not be reduced to a single feeling

In the selected Pensées fragments 275–282, Pascal distinguishes heart and reasoning, relates faith to God and considers knowledge of first principles. He also warns against confusing heart with imagination. This is a Christian apologetic framework, not a claim that any strong feeling proves any truth. We read a particular English edition with its numbering and did not collate the French. The limited comparison therefore turns “heart” into no simple measure of emotional intensity. It reminds us to seek a term’s meaning in the selected argument rather than fill it with familiar contemporary associations. No experience whatsoever is proposed as a sufficient foundation for faith, and no truth is promised through checking how vividly an experience feels today. A historical term retains its argument instead of silently becoming a convenient instruction for the reader.

Our invented person formerly associated faith’s correctness with a particular calm feeling. That feeling now arises less often, prompting a wish to explain everything through its absence. Yet a conviction’s content, the grounds for accepting it and current experience do not become identical because they previously occurred together. Why was feeling taken as the chief indicator, and does the specified tradition actually require that assessment? Its answer must not be invented on its behalf. Our reasoning proposes only that one description need not yield a hurried conclusion. The feeling need not be dismissed either: it may matter to the person. Its importance does not let it decide truth by itself, and its absence does not automatically reveal which thoughts someone now accepts or rejects. An experience can thus be taken seriously while the question about conviction remains distinct.

Not every ground is readily retold in one sentence. Someone might name an argument read, an experience of conversation, a religious text’s content and a personal address; this does not make them grounds of identical kind or strength. Each item’s supported claim and the conclusions beyond it need distinguishing. Clarification sometimes reveals a former ground as insufficient; sometimes the question becomes more precise while a broader relationship continues. Both possibilities remain open. People are not ranked by their grounds here, nor is listing those grounds promised to produce a final answer. Distinctions are retained so a need for clarity does not become a hurried search for one word which closes every question at once and prevents noticing where that word ceased to explain the conversation’s object or concealed an inference that still needed examination.

VI. Deciding and waiting need not always exclude one another

In the selected sections, James distinguishes live and dead, forced and avoidable, momentous and trivial options. Section VIII retains waiting for evidence where an option is not forced. His reasoning licenses no accepting every desired thought as truth, nor proves that every decision about faith must be urgent. Our invented example is not pronounced an established instance of his philosophical argument. Comparison asks only whether a final decision on this particular question is genuinely required now. An external demand to answer today does not itself prove the option forced by its subject. A factual deadline, conditions of specific participation and others' wish to hear a convenient declaration sooner need distinguishing, especially where that declaration would not be the person's answer. The philosophical vocabulary does not transform ordinary pressure into a sufficient reason to assent.

Some immediate actions nevertheless have deadlines. One can decide whether to attend a meeting, read a selected text, ask a question or accept a particular commitment. That decision need not answer every question about one's outlook. Where participation means a promise or profession, its meaning must be known before assent; where observation without such profession is possible, that limited role can be stated honestly. Uncertainty alone does not cancel an accepted obligation, yet an obligation is not created through another's assumption that everyone present agreed with everything. Our example keeps action's specificity beside a wider question's openness. Their objects differ; they form no universal sequence by which every person must eventually reach the same result. A limited practical choice need neither conceal the unresolved matter nor pretend to settle it on the way to making a plan.

Waiting can be an honest decision without always keeping a situation unchanged. While no final answer is accepted, relationships may continue, earlier promises remain or circumstances change. What remains open and what still needs agreement now deserve attention. This favours no hurried assent. It recognises that a pause belongs to a particular life rather than an empty space. An interlocutor can be told: there is no answer yet on this question; this immediate action is accepted within a stated limit; that promise cannot currently be made. Several accurate statements permit interaction without invented completeness. If limits cannot be agreed, ending participation may remain an available outcome, pronounced neither defeat nor proof of faith's absence by this article. The pause's consequences are considered without making them a demand to profess what the person cannot honestly say.

VII. Honesty requires no performance of certainty

Someone may fear that acknowledging a question will destroy others' respect. Our invented person wants to repeat a familiar formula in a wholly assured voice while inwardly unable to confirm everything it means. That voice supplies no further grounds. Where the formula expresses assent or a promise, the difference between what is said and accepted matters to participation itself. Meaning can be clarified, a limit stated or words withheld where they are not yet one's answer. The rules of a particular rite are not determined here; they belong to its specified tradition and situation. We consider speech's honesty without equating a powerful public voice with powerful faith. Quiet uncertainty can be more accurate than a persuasive performance, but is established as no compulsory style through which every participant should be judged or expected to display inward sincerity.

Every personal question need not be disclosed before a whole group. The ability to speak honestly differs from an obligation to tell everything. An interlocutor can be chosen, privacy agreed, conversation limited to a specific formulation or one's inward state left out of public discussion altogether. Reluctance to explain itself reveals neither concealed falsehood nor complete assent. Neither pauses nor facial expressions authorise reading someone's inward life. This distinction prevents a call for sincerity becoming a demand that a person be made available for others' assessment. Where participation requires a particular statement, conditions need clarity; where no statement is required, one should not be created retrospectively through presence alone or refusal to explain a question. Respect for speech includes respect for the limits within which someone chooses to speak.

An honestly stated limit guarantees no favourable reception. Another person may disagree, decline further conversation or find such participation impossible under their conditions. Universal approval is not promised. Disagreement can nevertheless be stated directly without creating a right to demand an invented answer. Sometimes another form of participation is available; sometimes participation appropriately ends. A person's relation to another need not be exhausted by disagreement over a formula. Courtesy, previously agreed commitments and restraint in attributing hidden meanings to every action can remain. This is an editorial ethical proposal, no description of every community's obligatory behaviour. Differences stay real and speech accurate so incomplete agreement requires neither performed agreement nor pronouncing another's entire life fully understood through a single disagreement. Interaction's limits are acknowledged without pretending they reveal everything else.

VIII. An open question can accompany an available action

While faith’s question remains open, someone can continue other parts of life: caring for close people, working, learning and keeping agreements. This proves no particular faith and substitutes no usefulness for religious content. Available action has its own object: a promised call addresses a particular person; completed work fulfils an accepted commitment. Every action need not become a sign of a final decision about one’s outlook. Our invented reader returns to an ordinary task after unfinished reflection. The question remains without necessarily occupying all available time. This return is pronounced neither a calming method nor a guarantee of restored certainty. It shows only that an incomplete answer in one area does not automatically abolish every possibility of acting in other available areas. The task’s limited meaning is sufficient without requiring it to carry an additional message about the reader’s entire faith.

Sometimes even a small action feels too closely tied to the question: reading a book seems an obligation to agree; attending a meeting seems a promise to regain former certainty. Actual conditions deserve checking rather than following one impression. Reading may examine a text; attendance may have another status where that is genuinely permitted. Conditions cannot be declared unrestricted merely because this suits the person. Clarification belongs to the particular situation. If a profession not yet possible is required, this needs recognition before participation. If no commitment exists, it need not be created through one’s own assumption. Consideration then leaves room for a decision without a universal rule specifying how many books or meetings must be completed to earn uncertainty’s permissibility or demonstrate a question’s seriousness. The concrete condition matters more than an invented tally of participation.

Reflection can also end for today. A pause need not promise a quick answer, and another conversation need not be scheduled beforehand. One remaining question and the passage’s title can be recorded and revisited if wanted. The examination may also go no further. Where circumstances require a decision about a specific commitment, that matter is considered separately; an unfinished larger question does not automatically answer it. No outcome is chosen for the reader here and no deadline set by which faith must become clear. Each step retains its object and limit. Action stays action, reading stays reading and a question stays a question; none must perform a final outcome that does not yet exist in order to have occurred or possess its own significance. Unfinished reflection is not treated as though nothing whatsoever had happened.

IX. Another person need not follow the same path

When someone has found an answer, another person’s open question can seem a temporary stop on the same road. Similar words, however, establish neither identical grounds and circumstances nor a matching future. A personal account may be important testimony about its speaker without becoming a promise of the same for its listener. Experience can be shared where welcome, without presenting one life’s sequence as compulsory for everyone. In our scene, an interlocutor explains why the selected text became convincing to them. The reader can respect that account while gaining no answer of their own through it. Difference makes the account neither meaningless nor a reason to hide uncertainty in gratitude for the time given or to preserve a good relationship. Listening and reproducing the speaker’s outcome remain distinct possibilities within a respectful conversation.

Another’s uncertainty is not our task to solve on their behalf. A source can be offered, meaning explained, a personal limit named and help agreed for an immediate matter. None establishes an obligation to adopt our faith, reject their own or disclose more than wanted. Respect permits substantive disagreement rather than requiring every proposition pronounced equally true. It asks that disagreement become no invented knowledge about an interlocutor’s inward life. Grounds remain a serious question which can be discussed; choosing participation in that discussion also remains possible. This is a limited editorial proposal about living alongside others, not a claim that every difference is readily reconciled or every encounter concludes in mutual understanding once the right words are chosen. The proposal retains both disagreement’s substance and each participant’s separate decision about continuing.

Faith without certainty thus receives no universal final definition for every person here. We have distinguished objects of uncertainty, assent to content, grounds, experience and speech’s conditions, considering limited historical comparisons alongside a contemporary invented scene. This permits a more accurate description without proving the chosen religious answer. The reader may end with an accepted conviction, remaining question, changed explanation or decision to continue no further yet. No outcome is compulsory. An immediate step need not demonstrate complete knowledge; it can honestly name what is known, accepted or still undecided. Sometimes that small answer suffices for a following conversation or action, which promises no more than its actual object and limit. The question can retain its seriousness while a partial answer retains its accuracy, without either being made to stand for an outcome nobody yet possesses.

What this means in practice

If you wish to continue, choose a small question or use the invented scene. No return to a difficult experience or account of your faith’s history is required. Record what remains unclear: an expression’s meaning, a proposition’s grounds, accepted content, participation’s conditions or a relationship to former experience. Keep several applicable matters separate. Make no self-assessment from the list and invent no missing answer for completeness. A question can remain unanswered; the record names its object rather than demanding a solution in one sitting.

Next, identify an available clarification. A selected passage can be read in context, a formula explained, a fact checked or conversation agreed with a competent interlocutor. Name what the action can answer and what it cannot automatically establish. Explaining a word need not decide truth; someone’s personal account guarantees no matching outcome for a listener. Arrange no unwanted conversation merely to complete the practice. An absent answer proves neither personal deficiency nor a predetermined outcome.

Finally, distinguish the open question from an immediate commitment. What genuinely needs deciding now? Which participation limit can be stated honestly? Which promise was accepted and which cannot yet be made? A small step, an open question or ending reflection today are available. Check whether certainty was promised instead of a particular action. This is voluntary editorial philosophical attention, not spiritual diagnosis, proof of religious truth or an established way to change experience. It replaces no necessary competent assistance and requires no enduring danger. No result needs reporting to others, and completing a record establishes neither faith’s presence nor absence.

Key quotation

> *“To know is one thing, and to know for certain that we know is another.”*

— William James, The Will to Believe, section V, complete sentence in original English. This distinction proves no proposition true.

Connections between traditions

1. **Knowledge and certainty: James V and Pascal 282.** James distinguishes knowing from infallibly knowing that one knows; Pascal distinguishes reasoning from the heart's grasp of first principles. Both permit asking what ground a particular claim requires instead of demanding that everything be proved in one way. The boundary matters: the empiricist position described by James allows the absence of infallible self-verification, while Pascal defends the certainty of first principles. These are different answers about certainty, rather than one theory of knowledge.

2. **Acknowledging incompleteness: Mark 9:24 and James V.** The father addresses Jesus while professing belief and asking for help with unbelief. James's distinction permits discussing accepted content separately from the finality of its grounds. The limited similarity concerns accurate speech in which acceptance need not pretend completeness: the article's person can name what is accepted and what remains unclear. Boundary: the Gospel address within a healing narrative is not an example of philosophical empiricism. The comparison promises no reader's healing and replaces no necessary assistance.

3. **Personal response and grounds: Pascal 275–276 and James I.** Pascal warns about confusing imagination with the heart and about reasons found after an initial response. James relates a hypothesis's liveness to its actual possibility for a particular thinker. Both help distinguish a person's relation to a thought from what that thought establishes. Boundary: a live hypothesis is not an imagined conversion and does not itself prove truth. In the editorial scene, a former calm feeling can be named as experience while the question of a conviction's grounds remains separate.

4. **Waiting for an answer: James I, VIII and Pascal 282.** James retains waiting for evidence when an option is avoidable; Pascal describes reasoning and waiting for spiritual insight where it has not been given. The limited similarity is the possibility of naming an unfinished position without pretending that an absent answer has arrived. Boundary: James discusses an option's properties, while Pascal concerns Christian faith and salvation. They establish no shared deadline or identical reason for waiting. The article separately clarifies present commitments, consent and participation's conditions.

5. **Faith beyond a single proof: James IV and Pascal 278–279.** James permits a role for passional nature in a genuine option not settled on intellectual grounds; Pascal connects faith with the heart and God's gift. Both consider what does not reduce to reasoning alone, but explain it differently. Boundary: James's philosophical permission to choose is not identical to Pascal's divine gift. Neither side of this comparison is turned here into permission to treat a desired thought as true or to demand a particular feeling from the reader.

Primary sources

1. Complete Mark 9:14–29, KJV.

2. William James. The Will to Believe I, IV, V, VIII; original English, 1912 impression.

3. Blaise Pascal. Pensées, selected 275–282 in the checked English edition.

Russian quotations are United Wisdom translations; the English Gospel literal was checked against KJV and James quoted in original English. Pascal is compared without a literal quotation; translator was not identified in the checked header/catalogue (UNKNOWN). Actual scopes are recorded in notes; Greek and French originals were not collated. Contemporary scenes and practice are editorial work with no established efficacy.

Tags

faith, certainty, doubt, truth, knowledge, grounds, question, meaning, trust, prayer, religion, philosophy, heart, reasoning, experience, conviction, assent, participation, honesty, speech, choice, waiting, evidence, commitment, boundaries, agency, respect, William James, Pascal, Mark

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.