

UNITED WISDOM

How to Compare Traditions While Preserving Their Differences

Traditions and Worldviews

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

W10 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

How to Compare Traditions While Preserving Their Differences

> *“Please, Sir, inform me still more”*

Śvetaketu in the Chāndogya Upaniṣad, VI.8.7; fragment from the English translation by F. Max Müller, 1879: VI.8. The renewed request is addressed to his father and teacher within a particular dialogue; here it sets a mood of attentive reading, rather than a universal teaching shared by every culture.

In a conversation, one person says “liberation,” another “salvation,” a third “awakening.” All three feel they are speaking about what matters most. That is precisely why it is so easy to decide that they mean the same thing.

About this article

Comparing traditions reveals questions our own language has learned to treat as obvious. What is a person? From what do they need to be freed? Why are some ways of knowing considered convincing while others invite doubt? Comparison can also hide differences: declare every teaching a version of one truth in advance, then select only the fitting sentences. This article offers a different order of reading: first reconstruct a specific question and answer within a tradition, then define the point of comparison, and only afterward discuss similarity. We distinguish translation from interpretation, a shared function from identical content, historical influence from an independently arising analogy. Examples from Indian philosophy, Buddhist texts, and Christian self-description serve to test the method here, rather than construct a new blended religion. The practical result is the ability to enter a substantial conversation with another way of thinking, preserving the possibility of agreement, objection, or an honestly open question.

I. Comparison begins with a question, not a collection of matches

Two propositions become comparable when the respect in which they are compared is clear. If one author speaks about the structure of reality and another about preparing for prayer, the shared word “unity” does not yet form a common theory. The subject needs defining: unity of what, achieved by what means, significant for what task? Without these clarifications, comparison becomes recognition of a familiar sound.

Three activities are worth distinguishing. Description reconstructs a position: what the text claims, and why. Evaluation asks whether that position is convincing. Construction makes

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

one's own idea from several sources. All three are permissible, but the transitions need to be visible. If a reader was promised an account of Buddhism and received an author's philosophy of harmony, their expectation has been violated, even if the new philosophy is interesting.

In his overview of comparative philosophy of religion, Mikel Burley shows that the field includes different subjects and methods: comparing religious beliefs, philosophical arguments, and ways of conducting inquiry themselves. This does not establish one obligatory method. It supports a more modest requirement: state the work a particular comparison does.

Suppose we are interested in the relationship to suffering. We can ask what actions are proposed, what causes of suffering are recognized, and what outcome is considered possible. These are already three different axes. The same advice to be patient can rest on dissimilar ideas of justice, karma, God's providence, or responsibility toward loved ones. Comparing behavior does not remove the need to compare its grounds.

In sound research, the question stays narrow enough for an answer to be checked, and open enough for sources to change it. If the question is “why do all traditions teach the same thing?”, the result has already been built into the premise. A more fruitful question is “what ways of limiting overconfidence appear in these two texts, and where do they diverge?” Difference then becomes discovered content, rather than an obstacle to a beautiful conclusion.

II. A tradition needs a specific face

“Christianity says,” “the East believes,” “shamans know”: convenient openings that often hide authors, periods, and disagreements. A tradition is not a single sentence. It includes texts, commentaries, institutions, rites, different schools, and people who dispute fidelity to its legacy. Choosing the scale is therefore necessary before comparison.

Two authors, schools, rituals, or official documents can be compared. Without additional grounds, a conclusion about them cannot be extended to everyone covered by a vast cultural name. Even a proposition considered normative within a particular organization may be understood differently in daily life. A teaching's text and an account of a community's behavior answer different questions.

Consider a hypothetical library where a philosophical treatise, a prayer collection, and a pilgrim's memoir stand together. All the books belong to one religion, but each shows a different side. The treatise develops an argument, the prayer shapes an address, the memoir conveys personal experience. Using them as interchangeable evidence may attribute one person's biographical emotion to the whole teaching or turn a prayer's image into a technical definition.

Choosing a specific face does not make general overviews useless. An overview helps us see the map and find important alternatives. After it, however, we should return to where the claim is actually made. “In some branches” also needs content: which branches, according to what source, at what time? A vague qualification sometimes merely masks the earlier generalization.

Stating the scale makes comparison clearer for a reader who disagrees, too. They can say, “This author does reason that way, but my school answers differently.” Such a reply does not destroy the article. It enlarges the map. If the author has spoken for the whole tradition in advance, a useful clarification will look like a struggle for the right to exist within it. Precision here supports knowledge, but also the quality of the conversation itself.

III. Translation connects worlds and also changes them

Translation is necessary: most people do not read every language they need. Yet an equivalent word rarely carries its entire context with it. The Russian words for “soul,” “consciousness,” “faith,” and “energy” already have their own surrounding associations. If they name another tradition's concept without explanation, the reader may understand the sentence too quickly—and therefore incorrectly.

The best first step is to name the original term and its working meaning in this text. This is no invitation to decorate an article with obscure words. A term is needed where a familiar translation creates a substantial error. Its role then needs explaining: what it allows the text to claim, what it is contrasted with, and what consequences are drawn from it.

In his overview of Chinese and Western comparative philosophy, David Wong discusses both the possibility of understanding across cultures and the limits of ready-made correspondences. The absence of an exact dictionary equivalent does not establish the absence of a question or thought. Yet a familiar translation does not establish an identical concept either.

A hypothetical example: two interlocutors call different things “freedom.” One means the ability to choose without external coercion, another independence from insatiable desire, a third participation in a truth that changes desires themselves. Starting an argument about who values freedom more may hide that the subject has not yet been agreed on. Definitions need to be reconstructed first; their compatibility can then be discussed.

The opposite danger is to declare another language untranslatable and stop the conversation. Between exact coincidence and complete unintelligibility lies a large working space. We can offer an approximate translation, explain what it loses, and test whether it holds up in a particular example. Gradual understanding develops this way. It is less striking than a table of universal correspondences, but lets us correct our errors without abandoning the entire comparison.

IV. Similar images can do opposite work

The image of a chariot appears in both the Kaṭha Upaniṣad and Questions of King Milinda. It is easy to take this as proof of one teaching about the person. Attention to the argument, however, shows why the same image is insufficient.

In the Kaṭha Upaniṣad, I.3.3–9, the chariot helps represent relationships among ātman (the Self), body, mind, intellect, and senses. In the dialogue between Nāgasena and Milinda, examining the chariot's parts helps explain the conventional designation of a person. One image is used in different arguments; a matching picture does not erase the difference in what it is meant to show.

This is an important lesson for reading symbols in general. Light may signify knowledge, God's presence, ethical purity, a physical phenomenon, or an artistic effect. Water may signify origin, purification, danger, or change. We need not forbid comparison of such images. Yet we should ask what conclusion becomes possible after they appear. A symbol lives in the text's sequence, rather than solely in a dictionary of symbolic meanings.

Differences of function can be more interesting than coincidence. If one author seeks a stable ground of experience and another examines belief in such a ground, a shared image can reveal a real dispute. Comparison becomes more precise precisely by preserving the contradiction. It shows how similar human material—body, motion, control, road—can enter different philosophical structures.

A contemporary reader benefits from separating a personal response to an image from its historical meaning. A chariot may recall the distribution of tasks in a team. This association is permissible as a personal application. Yet it does not establish that the ancient text was written for project management. An authorial analogy becomes clear when given its own name: “This image helps us think today about the following.” The source keeps its content, and the new thought an honest provenance.

Take the chariot images already mentioned. If we begin with “in which cultures does the chariot appear?”, we obtain a history of the image. If we ask “how is control of the senses explained?”, one side of the comparison will be much closer to the subject than the other. If the question concerns what makes a person one person, both passages may be useful, but the answers will still differ. Changing the question changes the comparison's meaning, even when the chosen pages remain the same.

V. A shared function does not mean an identical goal

Fasting, silence, repetition of words, and care for others appear in different traditions. Looking only at outward form suggests a shared set of spiritual exercises. Yet an action's meaning also depends on its purpose and the relationships within which it is performed. The same bodily movement does not yet mean the same practice.

Function and ultimate goal need distinguishing. A function may be organizing attention, sustaining a community's memory, or expressing gratitude. A goal may be liberation from a particular form of unfreedom, fidelity to a covenant, salvation, or participation in a ritual order. One action can serve several functions at once, and its participants may understand it differently. An outside observer therefore cannot always reconstruct meaning from form.

In the Catholic Catechism, §§1023–1029, ultimate fulfillment is described through communion with God in Christ, rather than the disappearance of personal identity. This particular example shows how little the general phrase “overcome the ego” conveys. Without further distinctions, it cannot replace a tradition's account of itself.

Suppose someone remains silent for ten minutes. They may be preparing for prayer, observing ritual order, letting another person finish speaking, or doing their own concentration exercise. The actions resemble one another in duration and absence of speech, but differ in their relationship to self and others. A study of silence's physiological effect, if conducted, would be another level of description. It would not in itself establish the truth of a religious explanation.

When a comparison is limited to function, this should be said plainly. For example: “Both practices include regularly returning attention; their theological and philosophical goals differ.” This statement has enough substance. It need not add that every path necessarily leads to one summit. Similarity remains where it can actually be shown, while difference does not become an incidental detail of clothing and language.

VI. Historical influence requires historical evidence

Two traditions may resemble each other because people face similar questions. They may also resemble each other through translation, borrowing, polemic, or a common source. These are different explanations, and similar words alone cannot select one. Influence requires evidence of contact: texts, routes of transmission, dates, knowledge of a language, citation, or another traceable connection.

Where no such connection is found, “analogy” is the better word. It does not devalue the observation. An analogy can open a new question without answering the question of origins. Two authors may independently notice a similar difficulty even though their conclusions differ.

Conversely, documented borrowing may bring a profound change of meaning. A transmitted concept does not always remain unchanged.

Traditions should not be pictured as sealed boxes either. History includes encounters, migrations, translations, and struggles over interpretation. Yet recognizing contact in general does not yield a specific chain for every favorite similarity. We can reject the myth of complete cultural isolation and require evidence for a particular historical claim at the same time. This is a consistent position, rather than indecision.

A hypothetical example: “inner light” appears in two books. If the later author read the earlier book, that does not mean their whole theory was taken from it. We need to examine whether they cite it, what meaning they give the phrase, and whether alternative sources exist. If the reading has not been established, influence should remain a hypothesis. The phrase's similarity stays an observation, rather than becoming a biographical fact.

This order matters especially in accounts of an “ancient unified teaching.” A beautiful explanation may gather scattered elements into a coherent picture, but a coherent story does not replace a chain of evidence. Readers may ask where the text is, where historical reconstruction begins, and where the author's philosophical hope lies. These levels can coexist in one article when none is presented as another.

VII. Disagreement cannot be declared a misunderstanding in advance

Sometimes people do dispute different definitions. Clarification removes the contradiction. Sometimes a real conflict remains: one author affirms what another denies, and the grounds of the difference are clear enough. Respect for traditions requires recognizing both cases. If every disagreement is explained in advance through imperfect language, participants lose their right to reject anything.

A real divergence can be stated without aggression. For example: “This system requires a permanent basis of personality; another does not recognize such a basis.” Why the authors hold these positions, and what difficulties they find in the opposing view, then need showing. The comparer need not deliver a final verdict, but must not replace the dispute with a claim that both sides secretly agree.

The opposite extreme supposes that difference excludes understanding. Yet a person can understand an argument without accepting it. We do this regularly in ordinary life when examining another's choice. Understanding requires reconstructing the connection between premises and conclusion; agreement requires further evaluation of the premises. Separating

these activities allows more attentive reading without making every page a test of one's own fidelity.

In a hypothetical conversation, one participant sees the highest goal in a relationship with a personal God, another in ending attachment to the idea of an unchanging “I.” They need not seek a compromise formula neither would recognize as their own. Each can be asked what their goal means, what problem it solves, and what description they consider mistaken. The conversation gains substance before possible agreement.

A true intellectual encounter allows another's text to change our question, but does not promise that it will confirm our worldview. This is its merit. A tradition becomes an interlocutor capable of objection, rather than a supplier of decorative proofs. Sometimes comparison's most honest result is “Here the similarity ends, and a substantive choice must follow.”

VIII. A comparison must withstand an encounter with a tradition's practitioner

Texts matter, but traditions continue to live in people. It therefore helps to consider how our comparison will sound to a person to whom it attributes a belief. One need not expect a single official answer: practitioners also differ. Yet the possibility of objection helps reveal where a researcher has occupied the overly convenient position of an outside manager of meanings.

An ethical problem arises when another teaching is used solely to confirm an idea chosen beforehand. Its inspiring part is taken, while difficult obligations, context, and the right to disagree are excluded. The source is formally named, yet its voice has practically disappeared. The remedy is to restore provenance and limits of application, rather than forbid all borrowing.

A hypothetical situation: a gathering discusses family memory in different cultures. One participant says all ancestral rites serve one psychological function. Another replies that, for their family, these are relationships with ancestors, rather than solely the experiences of the living. The researcher need not share the second person's metaphysical belief. Yet they must distinguish their own explanation from the participant's account of themselves. Otherwise, a comparative scheme becomes a means of depriving another person of the subject they are speaking about.

Access raises a further question. Not everything known to a community is meant for outside publication. A text's availability does not authorize every operation with it. Accuracy of content and rights of use are connected but separate checks. A respectful account does not remove the need to check a particular version, and permission does not automatically make the account correct.

A sound comparison leaves room for correction: it identifies the source, scale, and degree of confidence. The reader sees what can be challenged. Such transparency sometimes makes a text less categorical, but allows it to live beyond a first impression. When another person's clarification is not seen as a threat to the whole structure, inquiry can grow with the conversation.

IX. Two chariots: a comparison that changes the initial question

Return to the pair in the fourth section and carry out the comparison. The initial question is tempting: why do two traditions explain a person through a chariot? Answering only “a person is complex” produces a true but almost empty similarity. It does not explain why each author needed this particular example. Refine the question, then: what work does the relationship between whole and parts do?

In the selected sequence of the Kaṭha Upaniṣad, senses and mind enter an image of governing motion, while the Self holds the owner's place. In the dialogue between Milinda and Nāgasena, analysis of components leads to the conventional designation of a chariot; this is then related to naming a person. Kaṭha, I.3.3–9; Questions of King Milinda, II.1.1. The direction of thought already differs: the first represents orderly guidance, the second tests the search for a separate bearer of the name.

Now mentally remove the owner from the first example. An essential part of the distribution of roles disappears: the means of motion no longer relate to the one to whom the journey belongs. Then add such an owner to the second example as an entity that has been found. This produces an answer the selected reasoning did not establish. These two operations show the cost of the smooth formula “both chariots express one Self.” Achieving it would require changing the work of one text.

A more careful result is possible: both passages challenge the idea of a person as a simple, indivisible bundle of habits, but use composition differently. This is an analytical comparison of selected places. It does not claim the authors were disputing each other or settle the whole problem of personhood. Similarity helps locate a fork here, rather than resolve it. The same object becomes a means of posing different philosophical questions.

Change the initial question again: how should a person deal with their senses? Kaṭha offers more direct material for this question. Nāgasena's dialogue chiefly helps check what we mean by the subject of that dealing. The texts can therefore complement a reader's inquiry without becoming interchangeable teachings. This complement arises in our sequential reading; it does not retrospectively become a shared historical intention.

Finally, consider objections from both sides—as our reconstructions, without invented remarks by the authors. The Upaniṣadic side might demand an account of what happened to the

ground of the path. The Buddhist side might ask why the supposed owner was treated as established. Each objection forces refinement of the other position's argument. This is where comparison becomes an intellectual encounter: another text changes the researcher's convenient starting scheme and leaves a more precise question.

X. Difference is part of the result

Traditions deserve comparison for the sake of wider understanding, rather than obligatory manufacture of unity. Similarity may be real and limited; difference deep and fruitful. Both results matter when reached by a clear route. We need not choose between worlds at war and their complete dissolution into a single formula.

A useful outcome contains several clear statements. What texts were read? What question was asked? In what respect are they similar? Where does the meaning change? What remains unknown? These questions do not turn a living conversation into minutes. They show what actually happened within it. Without them, a sense of depth may be no more than a pleasant absence of distinctions.

Another teaching can help reveal a habitual premise: that the most important goal must be individual, for example; that knowledge always equals explanation; or that personality must be either wholly affirmed or wholly denied. Yet work continues after such a discovery. We need to decide which new thought we are prepared to accept, on what grounds, and with what consequences.

If comparison leads to a philosophical position of one's own, it can be presented plainly. No imagined agreement of all cultures needs to stand behind it. An author's thought has a right to exist without a universal ancient guarantee. Stating its novelty, moreover, invites others to discuss it on its merits: test arguments, offer alternatives, find limits.

At the start of the conversation, three people said “liberation,” “salvation,” and “awakening.” After attentive reading, they may understand better why these words are close in human importance and different in content. They need not end with a single formula. It is enough that each now hears the other more precisely and speaks their own word more thoughtfully. Such comparison connects people through the work of understanding and preserves what made that work necessary: the possibility of meeting a thought that has not yet become our own.

What this means in practice

For a first independent comparison, choose short, specific passages. Pick a question that actually interests you: what it means to change and what should remain, for example. Find two texts with named authors or a clear origin. Do not start with a dozen religions at once: a broad table accumulates names faster than understanding.

First paraphrase each passage separately. Record its main conclusion, grounds, and limits. Try to make the paraphrase recognizable to a supporter of the position, even if they disagree with your later evaluation. This is a useful preliminary criterion: before disputing a teaching, ensure that the dispute concerns it, rather than a convenient caricature.

Then state the axis of comparison in one sentence. For example: “I am comparing memory's role in recognizing a person as the same person.” Do not build expected unity into it in advance. Identify one similarity and one substantial difference. Give a place in the text for each. If the difference cannot be expressed without vague words such as “deeper” or “more spiritual,” the criterion may still be unclear.

Finally, separate your own application. You can write, “These texts help me distinguish a change of habit from a change in my conception of myself.” This is your conclusion, and its value does not depend on a pretense of antiquity. Check whether you have assigned today's task to the author. If you used an everyday example, mark it as hypothetical and explain which part of the analogy works and which lies beyond its limits.

Such work does not require agreement with every starting proposition. It requires discipline in reading. The result may be small: a clear question, two accurate paraphrases, a limited similarity, an honest difference. Yet further inquiry can grow from this. A grand conclusion without support must be defended as a whole; a small, checkable pair can be corrected at a particular point, and thinking can continue.

Key quotation

> *“Things which have nothing in common cannot be understood...”*

Benedict Spinoza, Ethics, I, axiom V, abbreviated opening fragment; English translation by R. H. M. Elwes: Ethics. The continuation concerns understanding one thing by means of another. The axiom is offered as a philosophical question about sufficient grounds for comparison, rather than a prohibition of intercultural conversation.

Connections between traditions

These are analytical comparisons; established historical influence is not claimed.

Positions and sources	Actual similarity	Limit of comparison
Kaṭha Upaniṣad, I.3.3–9 and Questions of King Milinda, II.1.1	The chariot image helps reason about a person, rather than merely adorn speech.	The first text distinguishes the Self, intellect, and senses; the second examines a conventional designation. The same picture supports different arguments.

Positions and sources	Actual similarity	Limit of comparison
Chāndogya, VI.8 and Spinoza, Ethics, I, definition VI	Both passages require speaking about the ground of what exists beyond familiar individual objects.	A teaching formula about the Self and a definition of infinite substance do not have the same conceptual structure. The question's similar scale does not establish influence.
Bhagavad Gītā, XII and Catechism, §§1023–1029	A person's relationship to the highest is essential to understanding the goal.	Devotion to Krishna and communion with the Trinity belong to different accounts of themselves. A shared role of relationship cannot become an identity of its addressee.
Questions of King Milinda, II.1.1 and Spinoza, Ethics, I, definitions	Both texts require clarification of what exists and how to speak about it.	Analysis of a composite person and a demonstrative construction concerning substance address different tasks. Similar rigor of speech does not establish a shared ontology.
Chāndogya, VI.8 and Catechism, §1025	Both texts connect the question of the person with a relationship to the highest.	Instruction about ātman and preservation of personal identity in communion with God cannot, without argument, be described as an identical dissolution of personhood.

Primary sources

• Mikel Burley. Comparative Philosophy of Religion, Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, 2025. Methodological distinctions and problems of comparative scale.

• David Wong. Comparative Philosophy: Chinese and Western, Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Problems of translation and understanding between traditions.

• Kaṭha Upaniṣad, I.3.3–9, translation by Swami Paramananda, 1919: The Upanishads. The chariot example; translation and commentary are distinguished.

• Questions of King Milinda, book II, chapter 1, §1, translation by T. W. Rhys Davids, 1890: The Questions of King Milinda. The meaning of conventional designation through the chariot example.

• Catechism of the Catholic Church, §§1023–1029. A particular confessional account of the ultimate goal.

• Chāndogya Upaniṣad, VI.8, F. Max Müller, 1879: text. Primary translation; the specified dialogue was read for the epigraph and table, rather than the whole corpus.

• Benedict Spinoza, Ethics, I, definitions and axiom V, translation by R. H. M. Elwes: text. Primary translation; the specified places were read for a checkable quotation and limited comparison.

• Bhagavad Gītā, XII, Edwin Arnold, 1885: text. Primary poetic translation; the chapter was read in full for the table. Poetic language does not replace Sanskrit terms.

Tags

comparison of traditions, comparative philosophy, religion, translation, context, influence, analogy, difference, similarity, Upaniṣads, Buddhism, Christianity, Spinoza, Vedānta, chariot, Self, personhood, liberation, salvation, awakening, primary sources, interpretation, argument, dialogue, culture, self-description, tradition, knowledge, methodology, responsibility

About the authors

Andrey Zarinsh is the author and founder of the United Wisdom project. He researches 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 the principles of unity and mutual understanding work in real life between people and cultures. Instagram: @ilkutki.