

UNITED WISDOM

Assessing Spiritual Regularity Without Promises of Miracles

Meaning and Direction

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

P-22-N04 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Assessing Spiritual Regularity Without Promises of Miracles

Epigraph

> *“by their fruits ye shall know them”*

Matthew7:20, a short contiguous clause in the King James Version. Verses15–23 concern false prophets, fruits and doing the Father’s will; impressive works alone do not certify spiritual rightness.

What this article is about

Someone regularly reads, prays, meditates or joins a communal observance. They want to understand its place in their life without promising a miracle or turning spiritual meaning into a productivity report. Asking about benefit requires clarification. Keeping an agreement differs from feeling peaceful, religious fidelity differs from a claim about the cause of a visible change. These can coexist without automatically confirming one another. This article examines regularity through particular aims, actions, relationships and the cost of an arrangement. The Buddhist conversation with the Kalamas, the Gospel image of fruits and a Stoic demand for coherence offer distinct ethical grounds; they do not form a demonstrated method for measuring spiritual development. The contemporary examples are original to this discussion. We retain the possibility of recognizing a particular benefit, leaving its cause unresolved and declining to demand an inner experience that cannot be assigned by a timetable.

I. Name a Benefit Before Assessing It

The word benefit can conceal several expectations. Reading may be intended to deepen understanding, prayer to sustain a relation to faith, and a gathering to offer companionship. When these expectations merge, one outcome begins to stand for every other answer. An enjoyable evening does not establish the truth of every statement made there. Understanding a paragraph need not produce unusual calm. Name the question’s subject without asking one activity to certify an entire system while also justifying all the time spent on it.

Suppose someone sets aside an evening to read a difficult work attentively. Over a month they distinguish two arguments more clearly and clarify several words. That is a particular learning outcome. If they also become calmer in conversation, that observation can be recorded, but a connection between the changes needs separate grounds. Reading does not automatically explain everything or make the whole text useful for every relationship. In this original

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

illustration, value lies in describing what happened accurately: understanding specific passages is recognized without expanding it into general spiritual efficacy or demanding proof of more.

For a religious participant, observing a form may express fidelity, remembrance or shared prayer independently of a measurable behavioural change. That significance should not be dismissed because an everyday table cannot capture it. Nor can attendance establish the same faith in every participant. One person comes to pray, another to support someone close, and another to learn about a tradition. In a shared activity, distinguish common conditions from personal grounds. Respect for meaning can then coexist with accuracy about what the group actually knows concerning its members.

A question can be narrowed: does the chosen time make room for this text; was promised help provided; does participation remain voluntary? Particular information is available for some questions, while others remain open. Different statuses do not fragment a life; they allow us to discuss it without invented completeness. A person may retain religious hope while acknowledging uncertainty about the cause of changed sleep or a difficult conversation’s outcome. A spiritual ground and a claim about observable causation need different wording rather than quietly standing in for each other.

II. A Promise Must Retain Its Scope

Before assessing an arrangement, recall what was promised. Reading together differs from claiming that reading will repair every relationship. Providing time for prayer does not mean everyone will obtain a desired event. Sometimes an expansive promise appears only after a pleasing outcome, although no one made it initially. Examine that new claim separately. An attractive result cannot retrospectively establish more than was observed. Equally, the absence of a miracle does not refute a promise concerned only with time, participation or an available action.

Imagine a shared evening followed by a successful work agreement for one participant. We can welcome the event and acknowledge the meeting’s importance to them. That does not establish that the evening produced the agreement, that it was otherwise impossible or that another participant will obtain a similar result. Conditions not examined may also matter. This original example does not devalue gratitude. It separates gratitude, personal interpretation and a general promise. The last addresses others as grounds for their decisions and therefore needs support suited to its scope.

Take particular care with a promise that cannot be clarified or reconsidered. If every success confirms benefit and every difficulty is attributed to insufficient faith, the question about the arrangement is closed in advance. The participant bears the cost while the arrangement

accepts no feedback. Ask which specific claim can be examined, what counts as a limitation and what could call for change. The answer need not be numerical. It should permit substantive discussion rather than require someone to explain every inconvenient outcome as a personal spiritual deficiency.

Religious hope need not become a testable prediction to be allowed a place in life. Someone can believe, pray and wait without offering others a guaranteed event. A boundary matters when hope is used to certify a particular causal connection or demand expense and obedience. The distinction respects faith and clarity in shared decisions together. If an organizer promises an available room and a time, those are the things to check. A supernatural promise should neither be attributed merely from a meeting’s name nor accepted without separate consideration when it is actually made.

III. The Kalamas: Consequences Within an Ethical Question

In AN3.65, the Kalamas hear conflicting teachings and ask whom to believe. The Buddhist response is not permission to follow any pleasant idea. Thanissaro’s version considers greed, aversion and delusion, harm, the judgment of the wise and qualities to abandon or sustain. The combination of grounds matters here: personal examination does not remove ethical questions or counsel. A participant’s convenience is not the sole criterion. This contemporary discussion does not turn the religious concepts into a diagnosis or a measuring scale for spiritual development.

The context continues with goodwill, other qualities and four assurances, and the Kalamas take Buddhist refuge. Using only the famous list of authorities to call the discourse a manifesto for unlimited individualism would therefore be inaccurate. We take a bounded question: which qualities and actions does an arrangement sustain, and what happens in relations with people? This is a comparison rather than an adoption of the whole doctrine. The source’s language about happiness does not authorize promising a specified state after a fixed number of repetitions. Its religious horizon exceeds an everyday assessment.

Suppose a group practises gratitude daily but prevents a participant from mentioning an inconvenient schedule. The activity’s name does not settle how the person is treated. Gratitude can be valued while the time is discussed. If refusing an unsuitable shift is labelled ingratitude, examine that particular connection: why is a choice described as a moral defect? This is an original example, not a characterization of any school. It illustrates that assessing an arrangement includes how participants are treated, rather than only the agreeable sound of the words spoken.

Counsel from someone trusted can widen attention to consequences. Trust still has a subject: what does the person know, which question can they help examine, and where does their

competence end? An ancient discourse does not automatically authorize a contemporary teacher to determine someone’s whole life. In an ordinary task, advice can be heard, compared with available information and left open. When people disagree, grounds matter beyond a demand for loyalty. Ethical consideration includes the person’s participation and attention to others affected, without promising shared agreement or one simple answer in advance.

IV. Fruits and Impressiveness Are Different

Matthew7:15–23 relates the image of fruits to a warning about false prophets and then to doing the Father’s will. Within that religious context, impressive works are no automatic certificate. The relevant comparison is that a spiritual name’s prestige does not replace questions about conduct and relationships. Yet the Gospel passage cannot become an everyday instrument for measuring someone else’s righteousness. One observation does not appoint a person’s place in religious judgment. We consider particular claims and arrangements while retaining the passage’s independent theological meaning.

In a shared activity, a fruit in a limited sense might mean completed help: materials assembled, groceries delivered or an inaccurate record corrected. Such a result does not establish the helper’s perfection or cancel other circumstances. If several participants made it possible, everything cannot be attributed to one spiritual exercise. If help came with pressure on the recipient, completion does not make the pressure acceptable. This original use of the image remains modest: an action is examined by its subject, manner and recipient, without claiming access to an entire inner life or a final judgment of character.

Sometimes a visible result consists in stopping an unnecessary action. Someone stops forwarding an unchecked story, making promises for another person or demanding gratitude. This can be described concretely without turning an absence into a miraculous change. Specify the situation rather than asserting that the person will never make a mistake again. A small correction may matter to the person affected. It need not impress a group to be acknowledged, while its cause and durability should not be invented to create an attractive narrative.

Fruits cannot be considered solely from the actor’s position. If someone regards their regularity as beneficial while relatives describe duties transferred to them, those reports deserve separate attention. Disagreement does not establish that the practice is meaningless, but it raises questions about cost and shared work. A changed time may suffice, or another arrangement may be needed. Relatives’ views are not automatically final, but a spiritual name cannot cancel them either. Return to particular conditions and agreements while preserving each person’s own relation to the religious content.

V. Regularity Does Not Certify Coherence

In Letter20, Seneca demands a connection between philosophical words and a way of life. The comparison helps separate an arrangement’s frequency from conduct outside it. Reading about attention daily does not settle whether a particular person was heard. Yet the Stoic demand concerning an entire life should not become our universal examination. We can consider a specific connection between a stated ground and an action. That connection may be partial, interrupted or unknown; it should neither be invented from a tally of sessions nor rejected beforehand.

Suppose someone keeps a gratitude journal and has promised to return a borrowed book. The journal has its own meaning; returning the book is another obligation. Making an entry instead does not answer its owner’s request. Yet delay does not establish an absence of gratitude or every possible benefit of the journal. Address the particular issue: clarify a time, return the book or explain the difficulty. This original example respects a personal arrangement without transferring its value to a situation requiring another action. Coherence is considered through an available task rather than speculation about a hidden essence.

Regularity can provide access: a chosen time offers room to read, meet or prepare help. That is a particular organizational function. Having a condition does not establish completion of the whole task. An open room does not mean a conversation occurred; a calendar mark does not reveal its content. Name what the arrangement sustains and recognize that part without enlarging it. A form used for remembrance need not produce miracles. A form offered as learning requires more than a tick to establish understanding. Assessment follows the subject rather than discipline’s general prestige.

Coherence does not mean faultlessness. Someone can notice a discrepancy, acknowledge it and change an action. That differs from saying no discrepancy exists because the practice is right. Nor must every error become a complete rejection of an entire life. Identify where words and conduct diverged, what can be repaired and which limit remains. A specific response makes the discussion substantive. If the only proposal is to increase repetitions, ask how that addresses the original question and what is actually supposed to change in the situation.

VI. Observing a Change and Explaining Its Cause

Someone may notice that several recent conversations were calmer. That observation deserves attention even when its cause is unknown. A schedule may have changed, a disputed issue disappeared or the other participant acted differently. Attributing the change to a particular practice requires more than coincidence in time. This is no proposal for an independent specialist study or measurement of loved ones. Keep the everyday description bounded. In these conversations I more often let someone finish is more specific than my practice now improves every relationship, and the former need not automatically establish the latter.

A note can retain specificity without becoming a collection of unnecessary information. Record your own action, the circumstance and the known outcome: I asked again, we clarified the time, both parties confirmed the agreement. Without consent, do not record private disclosures or treat another person’s response as material for a spiritual report. They may understand the conversation differently. Differences can be discussed within the shared task without demanding total transparency. Attention to an outcome then supports responsibility for one’s conduct without creating a duty to expose inner life as proof of benefit.

If no visible change appears, everything need not immediately be called useless. The question may be too broad, conditions may have changed or the form may have another purpose. Those possibilities do not authorize calling every outcome a hidden success. Examine what was actually expected and what can be known. An honest result may be that particular help was provided while a wider influence remains unestablished. Alternatively, a promise was not fulfilled and needs repair. Each answer keeps its evidential scope. An unknown can remain unknown without becoming either a miracle or complete failure.

Everyday observations cannot replace specialist grounds for claims about health, safety or other fields with professional requirements. A personal account of peace can be respected without becoming treatment advice. Reading’s value to one person does not establish the reliability of every adviser. The article keeps to a bounded description: a specific action, its circumstances and what is known or unknown. This suffices for many ordinary decisions about time and participation. A broader conclusion requires separate examination, which cannot be supplied merely by more spiritual vocabulary or more personal testimonials.

VII. An Arrangement’s Cost and Others’ Part in Choosing

A regular arrangement has costs: time, money, attention, preparation and sometimes other people’s work. Cost does not make it bad; it reveals conditions of choice. Someone may value an evening without automatically assigning their former duties to another person. If a shared routine is affected, discuss the particular distribution. Assessing benefit then includes the participant’s experience and the conditions for those nearby. Their agreement does not establish religious truth, but it matters to the shared activity and cannot be replaced by one person’s certainty about the arrangement’s spiritual significance.

Imagine a weekly meeting repeatedly displacing agreed family care. Calling the meeting beneficial does not settle the issue. Identify which obligation is transferred, who assumes it and whether they agree. Attendance might be less frequent or at another time; actual constraints may also prove incompatible. This does not judge religion’s worth in general. It concerns a particular arrangement. Respectful discussion allows differing assessments of the meeting’s meaning while requiring accuracy about shared work. No participant should disappear from the decision behind the activity’s spiritual name.

Expense also needs an intelligible ground, especially when justified by an unusual promised outcome. A person may choose meaningful participation, while retaining clear conditions: what is purchased, what is actually provided and what remains hope. There is no need to suspect every fee or require all spiritual activity to be free. An unknown should not be represented as a guaranteed service. If a shared budget is affected, personal certainty cannot replace discussion. One evening’s value does not authorize hiding the next cost, and gratitude creates no indefinite duty to continue paying.

It helps to state the possibility of reconsidering participation. Ask how a break is communicated, whether public reporting can be declined and which obligations are actually accepted. Not every form allows identical changes: a communal ceremony can have established rules which a participant knowingly accepts. A rule should not conceal an unknown demand or turn departure into evidence of moral inferiority. Known conditions allow a person to decide whether they fit. An honest assessment includes choice without promising that voluntariness guarantees a pleasant outcome or requiring a group to accept every personal explanation.

VIII. Do Not Reduce Spiritual Meaning to One Score

The attraction of one score is understandable: we want to know whether things improved and see a clear sign of progress. But adding unlike things can hide each one’s meaning. Pages read, help completed, a feeling of peace and religious fidelity do not become identical units when entered into one table. Counting can serve organization, such as recording books prepared. It cannot automatically become a measure of spiritual maturity, especially for someone else. An intelligible tally of a task keeps its boundaries, while a person exceeds any record of their participation.

Personal experience can be described in one’s own language without becoming obligatory for everyone. One person speaks of quiet, another of attention, and another felt nothing unusual. These are different reports rather than a ready ladder of worth. An absence of intense experience does not justify excluding someone from discussion, while an intense experience does not establish every intended outcome. Participants may be asked how they understood their involvement, with refusal preserved. Shared conditions remain separate: time, access, purpose and accepted obligations need not require identical inner states.

A practice involving faith in what is unseen may rest on grounds this article cannot assess through everyday observation. Acknowledging that limit is better than issuing a final verdict from an absent record. A personal ground does not oblige someone else to accept the same explanation of an event. People can agree on an available action while differing in faith, such as helping a library without understanding a preceding prayer identically. Help is then considered by its task and conditions; religious interpretation is neither a demonstrated organizational result nor a required price of working together.

Leaving aside an overall score does not remove responsibility. Particular promises can be checked, information corrected and consequences discussed. Those questions should not quietly become judgment of an entire soul. Missing a shift requires discussion of the shift; an inaccurate account of a source requires correction. A spiritual level need not be assigned first. Specificity preserves a clear response rather than reducing everything to vague opinion. It also leaves personal significance where shared organization lacks sufficient access and should not demand it.

IX. Choosing with Known Grounds and an Open Limit

Consideration may reveal a particular benefit: time was found for an important text, help was completed or an unsuitable agreement revised. Recognize that result without declaring the entire arrangement universally right. Costs do not automatically erase it; examine them alongside it and choose what can change. Continuing at another scale may be reasonable. A promise lacking grounds may need to stop. The answer depends on the subject rather than a need to defend an earlier decision at any cost or show that all spiritual regularity was wasted.

An unresolved answer permits a bounded choice. Someone might keep available reading for a near period without repeating a general promise about its consequences, or pause while conditions for a shared meeting are discussed. Uncertainty does not permit hiding obligations from others, but it need not require endless inquiry either. State what is known now and what new circumstance would call for reconsideration. This is an original approach to an intelligible decision, not an established universal technique. Its purpose is proportion between grounds and action, rather than guaranteed freedom from doubt or spiritual confirmation.

The sources offer no single scale. Each retains its own ground: Buddhist ethical consideration, the Gospel’s concern with the Father’s will and Stoic coherence of life. Questions about schedules and agreements are our own applications, not direct quotations from every tradition. Keeping that distinction does not prevent learning from texts. It shows where a question comes from and where our decision begins. Readers can adopt one line, disagree with another or retain a religious understanding separately from an everyday account. Shared clarity needs no identical worldview and preserves respect for difference.

Assessing spiritual regularity without miracle promises means asking it to establish no more than its grounds allow. Name its meaning, examine an action, hear affected people and acknowledge cost. Leave an unknown outcome open and decline an unsupported promise while retaining personal hope. Continue or change an arrangement without assigning others an inner experience. The conversation’s intended result is modest: someone understands the grounds for a next step, their responsibilities to others and the boundary of their knowledge. That clarity can support a decision without claiming to explain an entire life.

What this means in practice

Choose one regular arrangement of your own and one question about it. Do not assess someone else’s faith. Record what you actually do and the meaning you regard as yours: reading, prayer, a meeting or help. Separately name a particular promise if one existed. A spiritual name alone should not create a miracle promise.

Describe an available result without enlargement: a passage read, a task completed, an established agreement or a personal experience. Separate observing a change from explaining its cause. Name what remains unknown. Missing information should become neither hidden success nor a verdict on the entire experience. An everyday note may be insufficient for a specialist claim.

Examine conditions and cost: time, money, other people’s participation and transferred duties. Where a decision affects others, identify what must be discussed and agreed. Demand neither private disclosures nor identical feelings. Check that refusal remains available and continuation’s conditions are intelligible. The list is not an overall score of spiritual worth.

Choose one proportionate step: retain an available arrangement, change its time, correct a particular action, clarify a promise or pause. Tell those expecting participation what is needed for the shared agreement. Keep personal significance distinct from common facts. This is an original exercise in considering grounds and consequences; demonstrated efficacy, a spiritual outcome and the ability to resolve every disagreement are not claimed.

Key quotation

> *“these qualities are blameless”*

AN3.65, a brief exact clause in Thanissaro Bhikkhu’s1994 translation. It belongs with ethical consideration, the judgment of the wise and consequences; it does not make every pleasant feeling a certificate of right action.

Connections between traditions

Question	Primary grounding or original application	Difference and limit
What supports ethical choice?	AN3.65, harmful and beneficial qualities	Buddhist context and wise counsel; no arbitrary preference criterion.
What does an impressive act establish?	Matthew7:15–23	Fruits and the Father’s will; no instrument for judging others’ righteousness.
How do words relate to life?	Seneca, Letter20.1–6	Stoic coherence; frequency alone does not answer.
What is known about a result?	Original reading, helping and conversation examples	Observation differs from cause; no established general effect.
Who bears the arrangement’s cost?	Original discussion of shared duties	A meeting’s meaning does not replace agreement about work.
What remains personal significance?	Original exercise and limits of shared choice	Faith is not reduced to a score; explanations are not imposed on others.

Primary sources

1. AN3.65, Kalama Sutta, translated by Thanissaro Bhikkhu1994, Access to Insight revision30November2013. The narrative, harmful and beneficial qualities, wise counsel, goodwill and four assurances were read; the translator note is distinguished from the discourse. The key quotation is a short exact clause, with our own RU rendering. The page warns that this version may be outdated; the updated text was not read. It is neither permission to follow any pleasant idea nor a contemporary efficacy scale.

2. Matthew7:15–23, King James Version. The complete specified passage was read; the epigraph is a short clause from7:20, with our own RU rendering. False prophets, fruits and the Father’s will retain their religious context. Contemporary examples do not turn the text into a rule for measuring another person’s soul.

3. Seneca, Moral Letters to Lucilius, Letter20, translated by Richard M. Gummere. All §§1–13 and the parent title page were actually read in this task: edition1925, first printing1918. This article uses the bounded argument about words and life. Historical advice concerning poverty and household arrangements is not adopted as contemporary guidance. The reading, help, schedule and payment cases and the exercise are original, rather than research findings.

Tags

spiritual regularity, benefit of practice, meaning, promise, miracle, hope, faith, observation, causation, outcome, ethical choice, Kalamas, AN3.65, Buddhist tradition, Matthew, fruits, Christian tradition, Seneca, Stoicism, coherence, responsibility, helping, reading, prayer, consent, privacy, participation cost, obligations, reconsideration, clarity

About the authors

Andrey Zarinsh is the author and founder of United Wisdom. He explores inner transformation, the unity of traditions, intercultural dialogue, and contemporary spiritual discipline. Instagram: @andrey.zarinsh.

Maria Evilkut is a co-author of United Wisdom. Alongside her research, she seeks to test these ideas in practice and observe how principles of unity and mutual understanding work in real life between people and cultures. Instagram: @ilkutki.