


UNITED WISDOM

# Religious practice without a strong experience

Meaning and Direction

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

P-05-N02 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

# Religious practice without a strong experience

## Epigraph

> *“Incline my heart unto thy testimonies.”*

— Psalm 119:36, opening clause before comma, King James Version numbering. Standalone closing punctuation is editorial; other editions’ numbering may differ.

## What this article is about

Religious action sometimes occurs without a strong inward response. Someone reads a familiar text, speaks intelligible words or joins a shared form without former uplift. That description does not yet explain action’s meaning or reveal an entire faith. We consider an invented evening reading: what was done, which content received attention and what was expected afterwards. Selected passages from The Imitation of Christ, Psalm 119 and the Bhagavad-Gita retain distinct grounds and religious contexts. We do not represent every tradition and measure no sincerity through emotional intensity. The contemporary scene and practice are original editorial work. An intelligible subject, honest participation limits and experience’s significance without making it the sole measure remain central. No cause of changed feelings is established and no former response promised to return.

## I. An action can occur without a vivid inward response

Imagine an adult woman opening a familiar religious text in the evening. She selects several lines, reads attentively and closes the book. Such reading sometimes brought a clear feeling of closeness and calm before; today there is no strong response. In our invented scene she reports no illness and rejects no accepted content. Her question is narrower: did the practice occur if the reading was restrained? This scene represents neither every believer nor an identical explanation for every absent feeling. We consider a particular action, its meaning and conditions, keeping experience a distinct aspect of what happened. One evening’s description is insufficient for a verdict on someone’s entire faith, and no such verdict is needed to examine the reading carefully. What was done can first be named without deciding what an ideal inner response should have been.

“Practice” here means a meaningful religious action genuinely chosen within a frame understood by its participant. This working description defines no ritual or tradition universally. Reading, prayer, joining a service and other actions have different conditions; one action’s



@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

meaning cannot automatically be transferred to another. Speech's addressee, words' meaning and any promise created need to be known. Sometimes the specified tradition's rules require explanation from a competent interlocutor. The article establishes none on their behalf. Our example remains reading an identified text: it can be considered as reading without pretending that every possible religious action occurred simultaneously or that all outwardly similar actions mean the same thing. Such specificity allows attention to what actually happened rather than an imagined complete account of the woman's religious life.

An absent vivid response does not automatically make an action empty, while movement alone proves no complete participation. Between those conclusions there is room to ask whether the text was understood, where attention went, what was accepted and what expected. What occurred can be named while other matters remain open. The woman read the selected lines, noticed an unclear expression and retained a question. That is an identifiable reading outcome; it needs no special feeling to be described. Conversely, if pages were merely turned without reading, that description is more accurate. Evening practices are not ranked by spiritual worth here. Accuracy distinguishes an action that occurred from a hoped-for effect afterwards, without making either presence or absence of that effect an automatic judgement on the participant.

## II. Experience and meaning should not substitute for one another

A strong experience can matter to someone. It may accompany reading, shared prayer or a memorable event, and need not be dismissed because it fails to recur every time. Yet meaning need not be exhausted by intensity. Reading attends to particular content; a promise accepts a commitment; an address directs words towards a named addressee. Replacing all of this with whether enough was felt makes the action's object harder to see. Our woman can recall what she wished to read and why those lines were chosen. This requires no recovery of yesterday's state. Its absence can be acknowledged while today's chosen action and what became available to attention are understood. The former experience remains significant without becoming the sole permitted evidence that a present practice happened.

The reverse substitution is possible too: familiar words are spoken and formal observance treated as revealing everything about one's relationship. Content may remain unclear, participation's conditions unexamined and a promise unaccepted. Accuracy therefore concerns both sides. A strong feeling need not be invented to assess practice; equally, every repeated form need not be declared meaningful through repetition alone. No judging others by appearance is proposed. The participant is invited to name their own action and its limit. Some questions admit explanation, some remain personal decisions and some belong to a specified tradition's rules. Distinguishing them preserves form's meaning without making it either an

empty shell or proof that everything expected necessarily occurred inwardly. The examination concerns actual participation rather than a conclusion inferred merely from visible regularity.

For our invented woman, the immediate question may be an unfamiliar word rather than absent uplift. She can seek an explanation, reread a short passage and check whether another's formulation was mistaken for her understanding. Where clarity emerges, this is a result of examining the text; where it does not, the question remains. Neither outcome requires explaining every change in an inward state. Experience may remain another important question she wishes to discuss, or may be something she does not wish to examine now. That choice remains hers. Religious practice becomes no required way of resolving every difficulty, and necessary assistance in other fields has its own grounds. We examine action's meaning rather than medical causes or someone's spiritual quality inferred from the strength of a response.

## III. Historical language of consolation retains its frame

The Imitation of Christ, book II chapter IX, considers absent spiritual consolation within a Christian relationship to God. It urges patience and uses language of trial, self-denial and awaiting grace. A selected paragraph of chapter X also distinguishes pleasantness from goodness. We read William Benham's translation and retain this religious frame. It is no modern emotions study or basis for declaring a present reader's absent feeling punishment, personal fault or a required trial. Our limited comparison concerns consolation's distinction from the relationship itself. The whole order of monastic counsel is transferred to no contemporary life, and suffering is proposed as no way of earning a stronger response. Historical language is considered seriously while remaining within the source's own argument rather than becoming a universal explanation of another person's evening.

Our editorial question arising from the comparison is which part of the chosen action concerns its addressee and content, and which concerns obtaining a particular state. A wish for consolation can be acknowledged directly. It need neither exhaust the motive nor become shameful here. Still, reading may have become only a test for an expected result. If the woman asks each minute whether the same calm returned, the lines may recede from attention. Attention can return to the selected passage without a promise to feel something afterwards. This describes an available choice in the invented scene, not an established means of controlling attention or a rule under which everyone must assess their motives. The wish can remain visible while the reading regains its particular subject.

Restrained practice is therefore not automatically higher than joyful practice. A strong response's failure to serve as the sole measure does not make its absence better. That reversal would create another ladder on which a preferred state had to be proved. Reading can accompany gratitude, a question, quiet attention or no noticeable feeling; meaning needs more specificity than a general competition among states. An action's conditions within its chosen

tradition should be retained rather than remodelled for a convenient assessment. Someone considering their participation can begin with a truthful description. It may be small and explain no entire religious life, but that limit retains its subject instead of taking the place of an answer the person does not yet possess. Neither intensity nor restraint becomes a required badge of seriousness.

## IV. Asking for understanding can belong to the action itself

In Psalm 119:33–40 according to KJV numbering, requests for teaching and understanding accompany an address concerning God’s statutes. The passage includes delight, a wish to follow and a request to incline the heart. Participation is not represented as an already completed inward state in every respect. The specified addressee remains; the Russian quotation is our translation from KJV. Other editions’ numbering may differ. The limited comparison shows an address requesting something its speaker does not command as an achieved result. No understanding or strong feeling is promised after a reader says the line, and no universal instruction for religions is supplied. Our contemporary question concerns honestly naming intention within an already chosen practice, while the source’s religious words retain their own relationship.

Our woman chooses to clarify a formula she does not understand rather than repeat it as though understood. This can belong to attentive reading: learning an expression’s meaning, checking its place in the selected text and hearing an explanation. If she addresses God in her own words, that address remains distinct from a tradition’s established text. Both forms being available to her does not make them identical. Incomplete understanding likewise requires no performed understanding. An unclear passage can be named without making the question an accusation against oneself. Accurate participation is considered here, not exemption from every rule. A particular action’s rules belong to their own frame and need to be known before someone promises to observe them. Clarification retains that frame while making a present question speakable.

Asking for understanding need not demand that another person explain everything immediately. An interlocutor can help with one question, name a limit or suggest a source. Conversation needs agreement and time; every personal matter need not be disclosed. Our woman can record the question and finish her evening reading without making it an incomplete examination. Tomorrow may offer an explanation, but that outcome is not guaranteed or required by a deadline. Today, knowing what was read and what remains questioned can suffice. That limit respects both text and participant: neither needs to provide more than this small action genuinely makes available in order for it to be acknowledged as an action that occurred. Finishing the reading need not pretend that all its questions were answered.

## V. An action’s grounds can extend beyond a desired reward

In chapter III of the Bhagavad-Gita in Edwin Arnold’s poetic translation, Krishna discusses action, duty, sacrifice and gain with Arjuna. The context includes a battlefield and its own religious account of the world. Translator’s notes explicitly acknowledge difficulties in particular passages; this edition is treated as no uniquely undisputed rendering of Sanskrit. Our comparison is limited to an action not exhausted by appropriating an expected reward. The chapter is neither equated with Christian counsel nor its warrior’s duty transferred to a reader’s everyday life. Religious quotation justifies no violence, exploitation or refusal of necessary rest here. Our contemporary scene asks something narrower: is a desired feeling the sole meaning of the chosen evening reading? The question retains its modest object rather than borrowing authority for a much wider demand.

The woman may wish for calm while also reading because the content matters. If calm does not arrive, one motive receives no expected response; another need not disappear. She can recall the thought she wished to understand, question to revisit or matter to retain. This editorial distinction ranks no motive’s spiritual worth and requires no complete abandonment of a wish for pleasant response. It prevents reducing action to an exchange: a form was performed, so a particular state must be delivered. Reading supplies no guaranteed mechanism of that kind. A religious address similarly retains its addressee rather than becoming a button controlling experience. A relationship can remain important even where today’s experience cannot be described as a strong feeling. Naming its importance need not imply that the desired result has already occurred.

Distinguishing meaning from reward does not make consequences irrelevant. Harm, breached agreements or demands someone cannot accept are actual questions which language of nonattachment cannot close. Clear conditions and an opportunity to decline dangerous or unacceptable participation are needed. Our reading is limited to selected lines and a chosen time; it requires displacing neither sleep, care for close people nor necessary assistance. Its arrangement can be reconsidered where circumstances have changed. That decision does not automatically mean the content lost significance: it concerns the action’s particular form. Religious meaning is retained more accurately when it conceals no actual requirements or consequences deserving their own attention. The limited comparison leaves responsibility for those matters intact rather than treating awareness of them as an objection to sincere participation.

## VI. Repetition can preserve an opportunity to return to the subject

A familiar arrangement can make action available without inventing it anew each time. In our scene, the book has a place on a shelf, a passage is marked and reading time is limited beforehand. These simple conditions create no faith and promise no experience. They allow the woman to return to content she herself considers important. Repetition means another opportunity to attend to a subject rather than an obligation to reproduce yesterday's feeling. Sometimes familiar lines become clearer, sometimes another question appears and sometimes nothing noticeable happens. Each evening can be described within its own limit. A matching arrangement is not claimed to produce a matching inward state necessarily, and a tally of repetitions measures no depth of relationship to the text. Regularity concerns the opportunity; experience remains something more than an entry in that tally.

Habit can also obscure a subject: an arrangement is repeated quickly and only its completion mark noticed. This is a possibility, not a diagnosis of every regular practice. If the woman notices that the lines were not read, that fact can be named and the actually available arrangement considered. Less text, a more intelligible passage, another time or an explanation may be needed. None is an established way of improving a spiritual state. These are practical decisions about a particular reading. Retaining the relationship between action and subject matters more than defending an arrangement merely because it is longstanding. Yet changing an established rite for convenience differs from changing personal reading's time; a tradition's conditions require separate knowledge. The practical distinction keeps an individual adjustment from silently claiming authority over every religious form.

How to finish can be agreed too. In our example, several read lines create no duty to continue until a special response appears. The woman can close the book at the chosen time, retain a question and return if wanted. Where practice involves a promise, its limit is determined separately rather than abolished through a convenient rule here. Where no additional commitment exists, incompleteness need not invent one. A result can be stated precisely: this passage was read, that thought understood, this word remains to be clarified. A small ending retains the subject and requires no declaring everything clear. Further participation remains an actual choice rather than punishment for failing to experience enough according to someone else's or one's own measure. The action's completion is named without pretending its meaning has been exhausted forever.

## VII. One participant’s restraint proves nothing about another

People can look different during shared practice: one speaks quietly, another expresses joy and a third listens attentively. The difference reveals no complete picture of inward participation. Sincerity is not assessed through volume, tears or stillness here. Particular words spoken or a known commitment accepted may be identifiable; everything about experience cannot automatically be inferred. Our woman later attends a gathering and notices another participant’s stronger response. She need not reproduce its outward form to describe her own presence honestly. Nor must another’s joy be dismissed as superficial to defend her restraint. The two descriptions can remain different without a competition requiring one to prove the other worse or less real. Respect for one’s own experience need not be obtained by diminishing a response belonging to someone else.

Shared form nevertheless matters. The meeting’s participation and expected actions need to be understood. Words constituting a profession or promise require known meaning before being said. Where listening without such profession is provided for, that role can be identified accurately. Every gathering is not declared equally open, and the article determines no permission on behalf of organisers or a tradition. Conditions remain a question so outward similarity creates no false agreement. Respectful conversation can clarify role, time and participation’s limits. If agreement proves unavailable, attendance can be declined. Declining need not become a sweeping conclusion about every conviction: it may concern this particular situation where intelligible participation could not yet be achieved. Understanding form’s importance requires neither pretending agreement nor overlooking the actual distinction between listening and professing.

Nobody must publicly explain why former uplift is absent today. A private conversation can be chosen, limited to one question or declined regarding an inward state altogether. An interlocutor can respect the boundary without filling silence with a prepared explanation. Where support is wanted, the assistance actually requested deserves hearing rather than an immediate proposal to make the person look like others. A word’s meaning, an agreed role and a significant personal question are different objects. Accuracy helps someone retain their voice within a shared form. It promises no disappearance of every disagreement, but prevents disagreement from authorising invented convictions, experiences or future decisions on another’s behalf. The form remains shared while the person’s account and limits remain their own.

## VIII. Reconsidering a form can honestly attend to meaning

A chosen arrangement sometimes no longer suits circumstances. Work hours changed, new commitments appeared, the text needs explaining or content once expressed through action is no longer accepted. These cases differ and cannot all be explained through weak experience. Our woman notices late reading competing with necessary rest. Another time or a shorter passage can be considered where this is personal reading and an adjustment is genuinely permitted. Reconsideration need not reject the content. If assent itself changed, however, that question should not be hidden behind a convenient rescheduling. What is reconsidered deserves naming: participation’s method, available conditions or accepted content. One answer should not automatically replace the other two. The adjustment remains accurate when it describes the matter actually changed rather than maintaining a convenient outward impression.

A pause can have different meanings too. Someone may suspend an action to clarify its conditions or decide to participate no further. A pause is promised neither to restore a former response nor to end by a specified return date. Agreed duties towards others require discussion within their own scope; a mood does not cancel agreements automatically. Yet another’s expectation creates no duty to believe or perform a personal practice. What participation ends, which promises remain and what is still unknown can be stated clearly. This message can be brief and require no entire personal history. It identifies an actual decision instead of a convenient assumption that every pause expresses the same final relationship to religious content. The decision’s particular object stays visible rather than being expanded into an account of everything.

Continuing practice is therefore not the sole permissible outcome of careful consideration. Participation can continue with a clearer subject, a personal arrangement change, a question be asked or participation end. Each option has conditions; none is pronounced a universal sign of spiritual growth or decline. No outcome is chosen for the reader. Our woman may move her short reading and check only whether the text was actually read and a question named. Strong experience remains possible without being delivered beforehand as the result. She may also decide not to return to the action. Respect for agency includes both possibilities so clarification does not become a concealed demand to preserve form at any cost and subsequently call that preserved form someone’s free choice. The examination remains open to an actual decision.

## IX. A small action retains meaning without a sweeping verdict

Return to the evening reading. The woman can say: the selected passage was opened, lines read, an unfamiliar expression noticed; today there was no strong response. No part of that description needs to hide another. Reading is named reading, experience experience and a question a question. The action can be checked without demanding an immediate account of an entire religious life. A small honest result becomes possible: a thought understood, a remaining difficulty, a decision about another time or finishing for today. The result needs no impressive appearance. Its accuracy means correspondence with what happened, not persuading others that practice was intense enough or that absent intensity already makes it deeper than every joyful practice. Each aspect retains its particular contribution without becoming a badge for the whole.

The selected sources helped consider several distinctions: spiritual consolation within a Christian frame, a psalm’s request for understanding and action in Krishna’s particular dialogue with Arjuna. They form no identical teaching or contemporary law of experience. Our working distinctions and invented scene are editorial reasoning. Their purpose is to make practice’s question more intelligible while retaining grounds and boundaries. A reader need not accept every religious proposition to see why action and expected response deserve separate description. Nor must experience be rejected to retain action’s meaning. Between those demands there is room for an accurate relationship to chosen content and the real conditions of one’s life, within which practice occupies a particular rather than limitless place. Comparison invites that attention without pretending the sources settle everyone’s participation.

Religious practice without strong experience can thus remain a question of meaning, attention and participation rather than a test of inward intensity. The chosen action, its meaning and what is expected need to be known. Experience can matter without becoming the sole measure or its return being promised. Form can be reconsidered without concealing a question about content. In our scene the next step is small: clarify one word, choose an intelligible reading limit or finish with an honest description. This proves no faith true and measures no person’s worth. It permits action its own object and leaves further participation an independent decision, replaced neither by a demand for constant intensity nor compulsory abandonment of what remains important. The decision can be particular and accurate without carrying a verdict about all that preceded it.

## What this means in practice

If you wish to continue, choose a small action genuinely understood or use the invented reading. No difficult recollection or account of faith is required. Name three matters: what is done, which content or addressee the action concerns, and which response is expected. Keep them separate even where they coincided before. Assess yourself by no intensity of expectation and invent no absent feeling. Where meaning is unknown, stop with that question rather than perform a form merely for this record.

Next, clarify conditions. Is a promise created? Whose rules govern this form? Is the text intelligible? Which time limit was chosen? Personal reading can use a short passage and clarify one expression. An established rite requires known conditions; this article authorises no alteration on a tradition’s behalf. Where conversation is welcome on both sides, ask a competent interlocutor one question. Disclose no entire inward history and demand no immediate answer to everything. An unclear matter may remain open.

Finally, describe only what occurred: lines were read, a word remained unclear, a strong response was present or absent. Check whether an expected effect replaced action’s facts or comparison with another participant took over. Finishing, another small clarification or continuing no further are available. This is voluntary editorial philosophical attention, not spiritual diagnosis or an established way of changing feelings. It replaces no necessary assistance and requires no enduring danger. No result needs reporting; absent intensity creates no obligation to continue longer to earn the right to finish.

## Key quotation

> *“nor is everything that is sweet good.”*

— Thomas à Kempis, The Imitation of Christ II X paragraph 3, clause before semicolon, William Benham translation. Closing presentation punctuation is editorial; the consolation context remains.

## Connections between traditions

1. **Pleasantness and goodness: Imitation II X.3 and Psalm 119:35.** The Christian counsel distinguishes pleasant consolation from goodness; the psalm connects delight with the path of the commandments. Their similarity concerns the object of a relationship: pleasant experience is not considered apart from what a person turns towards. This helps the article distinguish response from an action's meaning. Boundary: ascetic discrimination and a prayer's acknowledgment of delight serve different purposes. Neither establishes that an absence of pleasant feeling proves fault or that the reader must produce that feeling.

2. **Continuing without a desired reward: Imitation II IX.4–6 and Gita III.** The first text considers changing consolation within a relationship with God; the second concerns doing one's work without attachment to gain. The limited similarity is that participation's grounds extend beyond a pleasant response. The editorial scene can therefore name completed reading separately from yesterday's absent feeling. Boundary: Christian grace and Krishna's teaching about action are distinct. The comparison does not prescribe enduring harm, transfer warrior duty to the reader or require fulfilling another person's demand without consent.

3. **A question within participation: Psalm 119:33–34 and Gita III's opening.** The psalmist asks for teaching and understanding; Arjuna asks for clarification of the path after counsel that has confused him. Both permit naming what is missing within an address already begun. The article can therefore separate a question about a line's meaning from a sweeping verdict on sincerity. Boundary: prayer to God and a participant's question in a particular dialogue before battle differ in addressee and situation. Neither passage promises intense feeling after asking the question.

4. **Attention's direction: Psalm 119:36–37 and Gita III.** The psalm contrasts turning towards God's testimonies with covetousness and vanity; the Gita considers desire that obstructs discernment. Their limited similarity asks about orientation: what does a person seek through an action, and what is allowed to guide it? Here this remains a question, rather than a demand for the right mood. Boundary: biblical prayer and teaching about desire in Arnold's poetic edition have different grounds. The comparison declares no universal fault in having needs, explains no emotional restraint and replaces no necessary assistance.

5. **Receiving and responding: Imitation II IX.4 and sacrifice in Gita III.** The first text names consolation as a gift received with thanksgiving; the second places received benefits within sacrifice and reciprocity with the gods. The similarity concerns refusing to treat what is received solely as personal merit or private acquisition. Boundary: personal gratitude for grace and a religious cosmology of sacrifice form no single exchange mechanism. The article promises no reward for regularity. Arnold's footnotes 4/5 remain relevant: this poetic edition is not presented as an uncontested Sanskrit rendering.

## Primary sources

1. Thomas à Kempis. The Imitation of Christ, complete II IX and X paragraph 3; William Benham translation.

2. Complete Psalm 119:33–40 in KJV numbering.

3. Bhagavad-Gita, complete chapter III; Edwin Arnold’s poetic translation,1900 edition, notes 4/5.

Russian quotations are United Wisdom translations from KJV and the identified Benham English translation; English literals were checked against those editions. The Gita is compared without quotation and with Arnold's caveats retained. Actual scopes are recorded in notes; Latin, Hebrew and Sanskrit were not collated. Contemporary scene, distinctions and practice are editorial work with no established efficacy.

## Tags

religious practice, experience, feeling, meaning, action, reading, prayer, faith, attention, consolation, joy, form, participation, understanding, question, repetition, habit, regularity, expectation, reward, duty, promise, conditions, boundaries, agency, respect, restraint, Thomas à Kempis, psalm, Bhagavad-Gita

## 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.