

UNITED WISDOM

Prayer as request, presence and thanksgiving

Meaning and Direction

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

P-05-N03 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Prayer as request, presence and thanksgiving

Epigraph

> *“Give us this day our daily bread.”*

— Matthew 6:11, complete verse in King James Version.

What this article is about

Prayer can include a particular request, chosen remaining before God and thanksgiving for something received. Their subjects do not always coincide, and they form no ladder of worth. We examine an invented evening: an adult wants some work to end favourably, recognises a relative’s help and chooses time in an address. Matthew 6:5–15, 1 Thessalonians 5:12–22 and Augustine’s opening Confessions retain Christian grounds; this represents neither every religious tradition nor an exhaustive prayer classification. Presence names a chosen action, rather than an established extraordinary experience. Request certifies no future event, gratitude cancels no unresolved question and shared form reveals no participant’s entire inward history. The article distinguishes content and limits philosophically, offering no spiritual diagnosis, response mechanism or promised feeling. Personal participation remains the reader’s decision.

I. To whom the words are addressed

Imagine an invented scene. An adult finishes an ordinary, quiet day and prepares to say a familiar prayer. Today a favourable conclusion to some work is wanted, but two further intentions become apparent: to remain before God without explaining everything, and to give thanks for a relative’s help. This is an editorial situation, not testimony about an identifiable person. We need not guess an inward state to distinguish three possible directions within an address. A request concerns something absent or something one hopes to retain. Presence here means a chosen remaining in the address, rather than a proven extraordinary sensation. Thanksgiving concerns an acknowledged good. The directions may coexist, although one need not quietly replace another.

The addressee matters. Prayer in the selected Christian texts addresses God; self-directed reflection, a written thank-you to another person and thinking about the future may have different subjects. Similar vocabulary does not make the actions identical. A reader outside this tradition can examine its language without adopting it personally. An honest description would

then concern the meaning of someone else's address, rather than compulsory participation in it. Where the address is one's own, a question remains: what am I trying to say now? Answering requires no exceptional eloquence and measures nobody by a text's length. It preserves content before comparison with another person's expressive example begins to govern the occasion.

The title's three terms therefore introduce a working distinction made by this article. They offer no exhaustive classification accepted by every religious community. No ladder of spiritual worth has been established between request, presence and thanksgiving. Within our scene, a necessary thing can be requested without shame about its specificity, and gratitude can accompany a further question. Someone can remain in an address without immediately reporting an achieved effect. None of that establishes that every spoken text is understood, every addressee interchangeable or every silence a prayer. The action actually chosen needs to be known first. Uncertainty about its name may remain a question rather than be covered by an attractive, general expression.

II. Request and the limit of command

A request begins by acknowledging something wanted. The person in our scene hopes that the work will end well and can name that wish directly, rather than portray complete indifference to its outcome. Wishing and commanding nevertheless differ. When another free participant is asked for something, hearing the words does not make that person an instrument. Prayer has its own religious grounds and cannot be reduced to a human contract. In either case, a substitution deserves attention: a spoken request is not a certificate of a future event. This article determines no mechanism of divine response. It describes the human action more precisely: someone addressed a particular wish, rather than received an outcome already guaranteed in exchange for a formula.

In Matthew 6:5–15 in KJV, address to the Father concerns need, daily bread, forgiveness and God's will. Prayer performed for spectators and reliance on excessive speaking are contrasted with another address; the following verses retain a serious forgiveness condition. This is specific Christian teaching, not a promise to fulfil a reader's order. Our invented comparison asks whether attention to a request has become word-counting. An open outcome does not itself make the wish improper.

A request has a subject and boundaries. One can want a conversation to go well without assigning another person a conviction that must be accepted. One can ask for support while still sending a promised letter oneself. Prayer does not mark that practical duty as completed. Work involving deadlines, documents and several participants retains actual actions and limits of authority. In our scene, the adult can distinguish today's responsibility from what is merely hoped for. This editorial distinction judges no request's theological worth. It keeps contact with

a particular life, so that an address supplies no ready explanation for treating a necessary step as unnecessary or someone else’s consent as already secured.

III. Presence without a demand to feel

“Presence” requires care. Here it names someone’s intention to remain in an address without making every minute an outcome check. It proves no objective event and prescribes no particular state of consciousness. The person in our scene may say that no additional requests are wanted now and choose some time before God within their faith. This describes a chosen action. It need not become a claim to a higher stage or a demand that every observer recognise an extraordinary experience. A sense of calm, if present, may matter; its absence does not reveal the whole address. This article explains the cause of neither possibility and provides no experience that must be reproduced.

Augustine’s Confessions I 1–2 already begins as an address to God. Questions about invocation and knowledge arise within it, rather than after complete clarity; the next chapter asks how God’s coming to the speaker is understood. Creation, faith and grace remain its grounds. This is no neutral presence technique. Our limited comparison allows a question within an address, while making no claim that every uncertainty constitutes the same religious relationship.

Silence has no single meaning fixed in advance. It might be a chosen pause, attention to a text, an absence of suitable words or simply the action’s conclusion. Another person’s silence grants no permission to attribute assent, profound experience or lack of faith. In our scene, a small intelligible time limit can be chosen beforehand, followed by finishing without an inward report. This authorises no discretionary alteration of a traditional rite: a form’s particular conditions matter. If proposed silence is unclear, a question can come first. Where “presence” demands continuous monitoring of each sensation, the demand itself deserves examination: who established it, and does it belong to this action? A confident tone does not oblige acceptance of someone else’s scale.

IV. Giving thanks for a particular good

Thanksgiving becomes clearer when it has a subject. A relative in our scene helped with a modest practical task. The recipient can recognise time, attention and a particular deed instead of declaring the entire day unconditionally wonderful. Attributing a received good to God expresses a religious understanding; it need not erase the helper’s contribution. Thanks can be conveyed separately to that person without demanding a shared religious affiliation. The distinction preserves an actual connection: who did what, and what was received. It reduces prayer to no social exchange, while preventing religious vocabulary from becoming a reason to overlook someone else’s effort. Thanksgiving requires no public account offered to prove the speaker’s own virtue.

In 1 Thessalonians 5:12–22 in KJV, thanksgiving stands alongside prayer, patience, supporting the weak and not returning evil for evil. The exhortation addresses a Christian community and concerns God’s will in Christ. It is presented here as no empirical mood recipe or demand to love harm. In our scene, thanking for received help does not call every event good. The selected lines provide no licence to impose enduring danger on someone.

Gratitude can coexist with dissatisfaction. Help was received in one matter while another remains unresolved; the two facts do not cancel each other. There is no need to choose between portraying complete well-being and recognising nothing valuable. One good can be thanked for and something else requested, with their subjects kept distinct. This matters when an interlocutor rushes toward a broadly happy conclusion. A grateful speaker thereby signs no agreement with every condition of life and gives up no right to discuss those conditions. Our scene allows separate statements about received participation and a remaining question. They form no mandatory prayer formula. The article offers a more exact description; the person chooses any actual words, including whether to speak at all.

V. When the three directions meet

A single address can start with a request, include thanksgiving and finish without more words. The adult in our scene recalled a relative’s help, named the desired conclusion to some work and then remained in the chosen address for a while. Every second need not be assigned to three separate boxes. The distinction serves where meaning is being lost. Suppose gratitude has become a means of ensuring the next favourable outcome, or requesting anything feels improper after giving thanks. A hidden condition has then been introduced. Thanksgiving is no payment for the future, and a request is not forbidden merely because another good was already received. We examine the invented scene’s editorial logic, without establishing a rule for interpreting all prayer texts.

The directions' order likewise certifies no quality. A received good may be recognised before a need is formulated, or the need named before help is recalled. An advance plan can preserve attention without becoming a test of flawless execution. Forgetting one item gives this article no grounds to declare prayer invalid or deduce the speaker's character. A particular religious form may have its own conditions that our scheme cannot replace. The editorial examination of an ordinary scene nevertheless does not require understanding to become a checklist with a grade for every item. The question is simpler: does what was said retain intelligible meaning, and have any unchosen promises appeared? An answer may require clarification rather than another duty.

The distinction can stop once its task is done. Where a request's subject is understood, gratitude concerns actual participation and a chosen pause demands no special effect, endless analysis is unnecessary. Philosophical attention need not supervise every word. Our adult can finish and return to a promised letter or ordinary rest. Such clarification guarantees no calm; calm is no measure of this article's success. Having described one's own words and their limits is enough for the present task. A remaining question can be kept for a later conversation instead of pursued through repetition until exhaustion. An unfinished scheme likewise creates no obligation to continue reading this article until complete inward certainty has finally been attained.

VI. Shared prayer and different participants

A shared form introduces another question: what does each person's participation mean? People may speak identical words while retaining different circumstances and needs. A common text permits no observer to assign them an identical experience. Later in our invented scene, the adult joins a small group, knows the address but wants no account of a private request. Where a form's rules require no such account, participation does not independently create a disclosure duty. Unknown conditions are reasonably clarified first. This article replaces no community rules and authorises no presenting incomprehension as agreement. It distinguishes the visible action from a participant's entire inward history, which has not become common property merely because the person is nearby.

Shared thanksgiving does not require differences to disappear. One person regards the day as favourable, another gives thanks only for particular help, while a third is listening. An established form may require a more definite assent; that assent needs to be known rather than assumed. Our editorial discussion gives no automatic right to count every listener as endorsing every religious position. Nor does it require demonstratively interrupting another address to explain one's boundary. Sometimes an organiser can be told beforehand how attendance is intended, or another meeting form chosen. Neither a shared atmosphere nor a friendly invitation replaces intelligible conditions. The interlocutor's freedom matters both to

someone wishing to join and to someone declining participation without intending to judge the others.

In a shared space, practical support can be given without appropriating another person's prayer. Preparing a room, allowing time for a chosen address and refraining from interruption are possible actions whose meaning deserves separate naming. They prove neither the helper's faith nor unbelief. A helper retains the right to identify participation limits. Our scene allows a simple agreement: the adult helps preserve quiet but undertakes no speaking on behalf of the entire group. This establishes no universal ceremonial rule. It shows why concrete roles are preferable to assuming that everyone present already made an identical promise. Ordinary relationships remain afterwards: assistance, respect for declining and the possibility of asking without demanding immediate disclosure of what another person keeps private.

VII. When a request remains open

The desired event may not have occurred when an address ends. The work in our scene will be settled tomorrow; today the person knows no answer. No explanation of that interval needs inventing in advance. This article determines neither rejection, trial, delay nor any other religious meaning. Such descriptions belong to different interpretive frames and acquire no certainty merely through a confident speaker. A person can retain their faith while honestly acknowledging that a particular outcome is unknown. Discussion with a competent interlocutor may also be wanted. Conversation need not begin with a commitment to accept an offered explanation before understanding it. An open outcome gives an outsider no authority over someone else's inward history.

A request need not become a way of blaming oneself for every unwelcome outcome. An unmet wish supplies this article with no evidence of insufficient sincerity, faulty pronunciation or weak faith. Neither is the opposite general explanation established, as though an external event had exhausted the address's meaning. Our scene can preserve distinct information: what was wanted, what was spoken, which actions occurred and what became known later. Comparing them may alter understanding without immediately reaching a final judgement of the person. Practical help remains relevant where needed, independently of an explanation. Prayer and assistance should not be made mutually exclusive merely because someone demands proof of the correct order of action. This article assigns no trials to its reader.

An uncertain future can coexist with a precise present step. The adult knows neither the work's conclusion nor another person's response, but does know to whom a letter was promised and when it should be sent. Another's answer cannot be guaranteed; silence can nevertheless be left without a false label of consent. A request may be made again without claiming that repetition raises the desired outcome's probability according to an established

rule. A religious form retains its own understanding; our editorial examination concerns avoiding the replacement of knowledge by wishes. Those levels should not quietly merge. Personal significance can be respected without presenting it as an observed law of events. The scene retains room for prayer, checking facts and an ordinary unfinished task.

VIII. Words that are actually one’s own

A familiar text can help someone express what is difficult to put into personal words. Borrowed form nevertheless leaves a question of understanding. In our scene, the adult notices an expression previously repeated without attention. Its meaning can be asked about, context read or a question left open for now. None of this requires replacing an entire established text with improvisation. Nor must a question be declared evidence of improper participation before the situation itself is clarified. An obligatory form in a particular tradition retains important conditions. In a freely chosen personal address, actual wording and a selected limit remain the speaker’s choices. This article makes no such choice on their behalf and prescribes no disclosure of everything that became unclear.

One’s own does not necessarily mean newly invented. Familiar words can be accepted as actually expressing a request or thanksgiving. Conversely, a personally composed text may be only an attempt to impress a listener. The text’s origin and the current action’s meaning are therefore worth distinguishing. Our scene asks: do I understand what these words concern now? Originality of phrasing supplies no measurement of the answer. A familiar address can be retained with one expression clarified, another permitted text chosen or the action finished. These are different steps; none is automatically more mature because it appears unusual. Unusualness certifies no sincerity, just as familiarity proves no emptiness. What matters here is the particular relationship actually chosen by the speaker.

Conversation about prayer may prompt offering another person ready-made words. An offer is possible where it is wanted and its conditions are understood, but it grants no authority over the recipient’s faith. A proposed text can be read, questioned or declined without explaining an entire life. In our scene, a relative intends to help and brings a small prayer book. Gratitude for the care does not require a promise to read it daily. The recipient can thank the relative for their attention separately and clarify how they intend to use the book. This preserves a human relationship without treating a gift as a spiritual obligation already accepted. Different expectations are better named than allowed to turn appreciation quietly into a promise that nobody clearly discussed.

IX. An exact conclusion to the address

At the scene’s end, what occurred can be named without an overall report on faith’s quality. The person made a request, recalled particular help and chose some time without further words. The work is unfinished, and no unusual sensation may have appeared. These facts need not combine into a success or failure score. This article certifies no inward acceptance of prayer. It offers descriptive precision so that a wish does not become established fact, gratitude does not erase a difficult question and silence does not demand a compulsory experience. Religious interpretation, where wanted, may be discussed within the relevant tradition with a chosen competent interlocutor. Our working vocabulary remains limited and gains no authority to determine the reality of a relationship to God.

A modest conclusion matters for the next action too. The book can be put away, a promised letter sent, a relative thanked or rest taken. None of these steps must demonstrate achieved spiritual depth. Each retains an ordinary subject: a book stored, a promise fulfilled, help recognised. A remaining question can be briefly noted, with a later decision about returning to it. Every uncertainty need not become urgent work. The scene makes this clear: tomorrow’s outcome is not hastened by prolonged checking of today’s description. The adult can finish without a complete picture of the future. Respecting what remains unfinished requires no abandonment of actual responsibilities or of seeking necessary support.

Request, presence and thanksgiving remain three directions of attention that distinguish content within our chosen scene. They establish no uniquely correct composition of an address. A reader may find one direction unsuitable or examine it only as another person’s religious language. Joining is not necessary to complete the scheme. Where an address is one’s own, its subject may become clearer without a promised new feeling or comparison with other participants. Where it is another’s, understanding and respect are possible without appropriation. This is a sufficient boundary for the article. Further decisions belong to the person: more reading, one clarified question, conversation or doing nothing now. Neither gratitude for something received nor the possibility of asking creates a duty to continue endlessly.

What this means in practice

If you wish to continue, use the article’s ordinary invented scene or a small address whose meaning is understood. No difficult memory, account of faith or prayer spoken for an exercise is required. Record separately what is requested, what is recognised as a received good and what chosen remaining in an address means. An item can remain empty or inapplicable. That is no mistake or demand to add an intention for completeness. An unknown addressee or wording can remain a question. A reader outside the tradition can describe the scene without personally adopting its address.

Next, clarify one condition. Has a wish become a statement about the future? Has thanks for help become a promise to agree with everything? Does a pause require a feeling nobody promised? Keep the question particular rather than judge an entire person. Established religious forms retain their own conditions; this scheme authorises no alteration on a tradition’s behalf. Where conversation is welcome on both sides, one question can be asked of a competent interlocutor. There is no need to disclose your entire inward history or require an immediate, final interpretation. An answer can remain open.

Finally, name an ordinary next step if actually needed: fulfil a promise, thank a helper, clarify a deadline or finish reading. Tie it to no guaranteed event. Adding nothing and finishing now are possible. This is voluntary editorial attention to meaning, not a prayer rite, spiritual diagnosis or established way of obtaining an answer. It requires no strong feeling, replaces no necessary assistance and obliges nobody to endure danger. The record remains yours. Neither requesting nor gratitude creates a duty to show it to others or continue until an exceptional experience appears.

Key quotation

> *“Let me seek You, Lord, in calling on You.”*

— Augustine, Confessions I 1, clause before comma, J. G. Pilkington translation as revised on New Advent. Standalone closing punctuation is editorial.

Connections between traditions

1. **The addressee before a request's fulfilment: Matthew 6:8–11 and Augustine I.1.** In the Gospel, the Father knows a need before the request; Augustine addresses God while asking about the order of knowing and invoking. Both place a request within a relationship to a particular addressee, rather than an impersonal command to events. Here this permits naming whom the words address. Boundary: counsel to disciples and personal confessional reflection differ in genre and purpose. Neither proves fulfilment of a particular wish nor removes Augustine's question about faith and knowledge.

2. **Continuity and many words: Matthew 6:5–7 and 1 Thessalonians 5:17.** Matthew criticises prayer for display and reliance on numerous words; the epistle calls for unceasing prayer. Their limited similarity concerns an address whose significance exceeds outward quantity. Regularity, duration and the object of speech therefore remain different questions here. Boundary: these passages establish no common measurable repetition rule in this comparison. The call for continuity is not turned into compulsory uninterrupted speech, and criticism of display does not prohibit every shared form. Counting words cannot establish a participant's inward history.

3. **A request alongside relations with others: Matthew 6:11–15 and 1 Thessalonians 5:14–15.** Prayer for bread stands beside forgiveness; community counsel joins support for the weak with refusing to return evil. Both concern an address inseparable from human relationships. In the editorial scene, a promised letter to a relative retains its practical significance after prayer. Boundary: Matthew's forgiveness condition and the epistle's community exhortations are not replaced with one contemporary ethical formula. Neither requires enduring danger nor makes an action the cause of a guaranteed fulfilled request.

4. **Praise and thanksgiving have grounds: Augustine I.1 and 1 Thessalonians 5:18.** Augustine places the desire to praise God within a creature's relation to the Creator; the epistle connects thanksgiving with God's will in Christ. Both discuss gratitude beyond a pleasant assessment of one's mood. The article nevertheless permits naming a particular received good without pretending that everyone feels alike. Boundary: confessional reflection on imparted faith and brief community counsel form no empirical technique. Thanksgiving becomes no endorsement of harm, and its expression certifies no person's inward state.

5. **A question remains within an address: Augustine I.2 and 1 Thessalonians 5:19–22.** Augustine asks how God can enter someone whose existence already depends on God; the epistle retains examination and discerning good alongside respect for prophecy. Their limited similarity permits continuing an address while discerning, rather than replacing a question with a performance of completeness. Boundary: a question about the Creator's presence and community discernment of prophecy concern different objects. They form no single theory of

evidence. The article's presence without required extraordinary feeling is not attributed to them as an established psychological category.

Primary sources

1. Complete Matthew 6:5–15, KJV.

2. Complete 1 Thessalonians 5:12–22, KJV.

3. Augustine. Complete Confessions I 1–2, J. G. Pilkington translation revised on New Advent.

Russian quotations are United Wisdom translations from KJV and the identified Pilkington revision; English literals were checked against those editions. Actual scopes and rights limits are recorded in notes. Greek and Latin were not collated. Contemporary scenes, the three-part distinction and practice are editorial work with no established efficacy.

Tags

prayer, request, presence, thanksgiving, faith, God, address, meaning, attention, action, need, bread, forgiveness, expectation, outcome, responsibility, assistance, gratitude, words, silence, participation, community, freedom, boundaries, question, Augustine, Matthew, Paul, understanding, agency

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.