

UNITED WISDOM

Wonder: Asking Questions of the Familiar World

Meaning and the Path

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

P10 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Wonder: Asking Questions of the Familiar World

How does the familiar become a subject of inquiry again?

United Wisdom · Meaning and the Path · P10 · Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

About this article

The zipper on your jacket has split in the middle. You pull the slider down, then up, holding the fabric out of the way. Usually, your hands know what to do. But consider a question: how do two rows of teeth become a single fastening? Suddenly, a familiar object feels a little less familiar. You know how to use it. Explaining its construction may be another matter.

This brief pause makes you neither ignorant nor suddenly wise. It simply separates two relationships with the world: recognizing what you encounter and understanding how it works. Between them, there is room for a question.

This article considers wonder as a possible beginning of inquiry. There is no obligation to marvel at every morning, and no suggestion that wonder belongs to a gifted few. The transition that interests us is smaller: a familiar explanation has stopped being sufficient, and someone is willing to examine it. Philosophy, psychological research, and everyday examples play different roles here. The ordinary scenes are imagined invitations to reflect, not evidence for the claims.

1. Familiar does not necessarily mean understood

You do not need to investigate your entire home each morning. The handle opens the door, the switch turns on the light, and the kettle is where you left it. Habit spares us from starting again every time. It helps us get ready for work, prepare breakfast, and listen to someone nearby. If every object required a complete explanation before use, an ordinary day might never begin.

Yet convenience has a boundary: recognition sometimes slips into the place of understanding. We give something a name and feel the question is settled. Why has the window misted up? Condensation. Why has someone not replied? They are busy. The first answer names a process that could be explained further. The second offers a hypothesis about another person. Both can sound equally confident despite having very different foundations.

Wonder can arise here without an extraordinary event. You need not see the northern lights; it may be enough to notice that your explanation ends with a word. What does condensation

mean? How do you know that the person is busy? The question restores a distinction between what was observed, what comes from a reliable source, and what we supplied ourselves to make the picture feel complete.

This does not require suspecting every belief. Knowledge can be dependable and incomplete. You can use a map correctly without knowing how satellite images are made. You can recognize a melody without being able to write its notes and still genuinely know it by ear. Different tasks require different kinds of understanding. The difficulty comes when one kind quietly passes for another.

A useful question is therefore less “Why do I know nothing?” than “What, exactly, can I explain here?” It leaves more room for work and less for self-reproach. You can retain what you know, identify a particular gap, and decide whether to explore it today. Sometimes you will. Sometimes it is enough to fasten the zipper and leave the house.

2. Perplexity can be a beginning

In Plato’s Theaetetus, Socrates’ companion describes feeling dizzy at the difficulties under discussion. Socrates connects this wonder with philosophy’s beginning. The setting matters: this is perplexity before questions that resist an established understanding, rather than serene admiration. It is a philosophical scene, not a psychological account of everyone who experiences wonder. Plato, Theaetetus.

An everyday version is easy to imagine. Two people remember a conversation differently. Each is certain of what they heard. You could immediately decide who is at fault. Or you could first notice the difficulty: there is an event, two memories, and several possible explanations for their difference. Recognizing that difficulty does not establish which memory is more accurate. It does keep the question from disappearing behind the first convenient accusation.

Perplexity can be uncomfortable. It interrupts a polished answer, slows a conversation, and makes us revisit a confident statement. In a group where everyone is expected to understand quickly, saying “I do not see how these things connect” may feel like defeat. Yet the pause alone tells us little about someone’s ability. Perhaps they noticed a gap others missed. Perhaps they need some background knowledge.

Either possibility allows a next step. Ask for an example, return to a definition, or check the starting assumptions. Acknowledge that a discussion is currently too difficult and choose an accessible introduction. Wonder does not exempt us from learning. It can give us a personal reason to learn: a question we want to clarify, through our own effort and with help, rather than another topic we are supposed to master.

Nor is confusion automatically fruitful. If someone grows increasingly obscure and treats requests for clarification as intellectual or spiritual immaturity, we can question the explanation. The right to ask includes expecting an intelligible answer where one is possible. Respect for complexity does not oblige us to mistake every obscurity for depth. Sometimes inquiry begins with a simple request: show me what you mean.

3. Wonder is allowed to end in an explanation

In the first book of the Metaphysics, Aristotle connects philosophical inquiry with wonder at difficulties. Yet the movement continues toward knowing causes: learning changes our response to what initially astonished us. Wonder here leads toward understanding rather than preserving mystery indefinitely. This is a philosophical account of knowing, not an experimental model of learning. Aristotle, Metaphysics, I.2.

For our purposes, understanding need not be a disappointment. It can seem that discovering how a trick, a beautiful phenomenon, or an artistic device works will remove everything interesting. That may happen to a particular impression. It need not become a general reason to avoid explanation. Pleasure in the unexpected and interest in how something works can follow one another. We do not have to preserve the first at any cost.

Imagine someone understanding a simple musical rhythm for the first time. Previously, they heard a movement they wanted to repeat. Now they can notice where an expectation forms and what happens to it next. Their feeling has not necessarily become deeper. But another way of listening is available. Familiar music can now be approached from an additional direction, should they want to take it.

The outcome can be more ordinary. An explanation of the misted window is sufficient, and the person stops thinking about it. No new worldview appears; no chain of discoveries follows. That is a reasonable ending too. A question’s value is not measured by how many further questions it must generate. Inquiry can arrive at a working answer, especially when the task is small and specific.

We can therefore distinguish openness to a question from loyalty to a mystery. In the first case, we allow an answer to change our understanding. In the second, we may quietly insist that the world remain inexplicable. The wonder considered here needs no such commitment. It leaves room for further uncertainty and for a well-founded “Now I understand.”

4. Pause before judging, then keep going

In The Passions of the Soul, Descartes describes wonder at the unfamiliar as preceding a judgment of benefit or harm. He also warns that excessive wonder can obstruct understanding. These are seventeenth-century philosophical claims, not a direct account of the modern brain. Their useful tension here is between noticing the unfamiliar and continuing to investigate it. Descartes, articles 53, 75–76.

Imagine a courtyard where a patch of grass has stopped being mown. Your first reaction might be annoyance: nobody cares for this place anymore. Or approval: at last, someone is making room for nature. Both judgments arrive before information about the decision. The patch might have been left deliberately; maintenance might simply be delayed. What you see does not yet tell you which story lies behind it.

A pause before judgment does not require pretending to have no preferences. Some of us value a tidy appearance; others value plant diversity. We can keep those preferences while finding out what happened. “I dislike this” and “I know why it was done” are different statements. The first is directly available to us. The second requires information we may not have at the moment of our first response.

An endless pause is not the goal either. We cannot postpone every decision because additional explanations remain possible. If a path is blocked, a practical problem needs attention. If a service is responsible, information can be requested. In this discussion, wonder matters insofar as it helps clarify the situation. It need not become an attractive excuse for indefinitely avoiding an action that is already sufficiently justified.

That measure separates inquiry from collecting marvels. We can spend an evening among astonishing facts without examining any one of them closely enough to understand its basis. Or we can investigate one modest question without much emotional excitement. This is no contest of impressions. What matters is what follows the pause: clarification, checking, a new distinction, or an honest account of what remains unresolved.

5. Try explaining what you know

Leonid Rozenblit and Frank Keil investigated an “illusion of explanatory depth.” Their first study involved 16 Yale graduate students; the second involved 33 undergraduates. Participants rated their understanding of devices, attempted explanations, and rated their knowledge again. Ratings fell after attempts to explain. These were limited samples and particular tasks; the result does not make every confident belief false. Rozenblit & Keil, 2002, studies 1–2.

For everyday reflection, we can borrow a small move without turning it into a diagnostic test. Choose something that interests you and try explaining how it works in a few connected

sentences. Where does “And then it somehow…” appear? That may be the location of your next question. You need not test the entire picture at once. Identify one transition you cannot yet describe.

For example, you may confidently use an app to plan a journey. Your explanation, however, might merge two tasks: determining the phone’s location and choosing a route to the destination. The app combines them so conveniently that the distinction barely appears. Separating them makes your interest more precise. Instead of understanding the entire navigation system, you might first investigate where information about closed roads comes from and how it is updated.

This need not become a public examination. Asking someone to explain an obvious object can be a way of embarrassing them. Attention then shifts from how the world works to defending one’s standing. The shared purpose can be stated beforehand: we are finding gaps in our understanding, rather than ranking intelligence. Someone should also be free to decline that kind of conversation.

A gap does not require immediate filling. Daily life depends on a division of labor and trust in other people’s expertise. Nobody must independently reproduce all the knowledge supporting their day. Still, trust in an expert differs from an explanation of your own. “I follow these instructions because I trust the source” can be more accurate than “I fully understand why this works.” That accuracy preserves a foundation while naming its nature.

6. Wanting an answer and enjoying the unknown

For this article, we distinguish surprise, wonder, and curiosity provisionally. Surprise marks a departure from expectation. Wonder names the pause before that departure; curiosity names a desire for missing information. These are working distinctions, not universal definitions of feelings. In lived experience, they may overlap, carry different names, or never appear as three separate parts.

The distinction helps us notice what we want. Encountering an unusual object, we might seek another striking impression. We might become interested in its history. We might ask what it is for and lose interest once answered. None makes us a worse person. Yet understanding cannot simply be expected from a succession of impressions. Sometimes we must choose one question and stay beyond its initial novelty.

Limited experimental evidence also connects curiosity and memory. In Gruber, Gelman, and Ranganath’s study, participants rated interest in trivia questions and saw faces while awaiting answers. The authors reported better memory under high curiosity, including a separate next-day test. Here we use the abstract and figure captions; the full method and sample size

were not checked. This does not establish a benefit from every experience of wonder. Gruber, Gelman & Ranganath, 2014.

That report offers neither a guaranteed memory technique nor a requirement to make learning continuously entertaining. Philosophical questioning and interest in a trivia answer do not become identical because nearby words describe them. The research invites attention to interest while leaving the ordinary work in place: reading, comparing, revisiting material, and checking what we have understood and retained.

We can begin with a question that matters personally, then accept a quieter part of the journey. Find a definition. Read some dull paragraphs without which an appealing conclusion remains unclear. Discover that the original question was imprecise. Interest may persist or fade. It can help us begin without accompanying every minute. Wonder makes no promise that we will remain fascinated by the topic we chose.

7. Making a question more precise

“Why is everything like this?” expresses attention but makes a difficult starting point. Everything contains too many subjects. Choose one observable case instead. Why do the benches in this courtyard face the road? Why did several people understand one word differently in today’s conversation? Narrowing a question does not make it trivial. It lets us identify what information could actually help answer it.

Next, separate description from explanation. “Three people said nothing in the meeting” describes an observation. “They were not interested” proposes a cause. “We must change the format immediately” already points toward action. The transitions deserve examination. Perhaps the format matters. Perhaps people agreed, were tired, or lacked time to prepare. One observation does not select a single story, however persuasive that story feels.

Then ask what answer could change your initial view. If no new information matters, perhaps the question expresses frustration, invites an argument, or serves a rhetorical purpose. Those have their place in speech, but they do different work from inquiry. The distinction is useful first to the questioner: am I trying to understand, to be heard, to defend a decision, or to demonstrate that I am right?

Questions also need different forms of checking. A diagram can explain a fastening. Documents and testimony can illuminate a courtyard’s history. A poem’s meaning is discussed through its language and reasoned interpretation; several readings may remain defensible. A question about someone’s intention calls for conversation, which still gives no complete access to their inner life. The appropriate approach depends on what we seek to know.

Finally, a question needs a proportionate stopping point. An everyday decision may require instructions and one clarification from a specialist. A public claim needs more substantial checking. We can name the task beforehand: “I want to explain the basic principle” or “I need to decide what to do tomorrow.” Inquiry need not consume the day. It gains a standard of sufficiency that can be reconsidered when necessary.

8. Another person is not a mystery at our disposal

Wonder readily turns toward people. Why does a neighbor celebrate differently? Why does a colleague avoid shared lunches? Why has someone close to us chosen a pursuit we find uninteresting? Such questions may express a wish to understand or conceal a demand for justification. The difference lies partly in what answer we will accept. Do we allow someone not to explain their life?

A question does not become respectful simply because we say “I am just curious.” One person’s interest does not oblige another to disclose a personal history, speak for a culture, or provide free instruction. We can first check whether conversation is welcome. We can read available material ourselves. We can ask about a particular action without making someone represent a vast and internally varied group.

Imagine a shared table where someone declines a dish. Curiosity offers a dozen possible reasons. Hospitality may need only a practical question: what would suit you? Care is not measured here by the quantity of information obtained. It appears in solving a shared problem without demanding more disclosure than someone intended. Not every gap in our knowledge prevents a good relationship.

If a conversation does begin, leave room for an unexpected answer. Otherwise, the question merely invites confirmation of a finished picture. Someone describes a habit, and we hear only a cultural symbol. They mention convenience, and we search for hidden drama. Wonder here means allowing their explanation to matter, even when it is less striking than the story we had already imagined.

This does not rule out criticism of actions affecting others. Personal boundaries can be respected while clarity is expected in shared decisions. Name the subject: an agreement, consequences, responsibility. Curiosity then need not disguise control, and respect need not forbid every question. The relevant distinction is precise: the freedom to investigate the world grants no unlimited right to investigate another person against their wishes.

9. The right to an ordinary day

Sometimes an invitation to wonder sounds like another standard for living correctly. Notice beauty, ask profound questions, preserve a child’s openness, and turn a grocery trip into a small discovery. Yet someone may have other tasks: hurrying, caring for a relative, finishing work, or simply getting home. An ordinary day does not become a failure because it delivered no memorable insight.

Wonder does not become more sincere when scheduled as an obligation. We can make a little room for a question: leave something unresolved, keep a book nearby, return to a conversation. Strong feeling may never appear. Attentive action remains possible. Checking a fact, correcting an error, or reading an explanation can be enough. Inquiry does not need a vivid inner event for its outcome to matter.

We should especially avoid judging another life by visible curiosity. Silence in a museum does not show that someone noticed nothing. An absence of questions after a lecture proves neither understanding nor indifference. We see only part of what is happening and often lack context. Asking questions of the familiar world can include examining our own habit of quickly explaining other people through convenient judgments of character.

Sometimes the best way to retain a question is to postpone it. Write a sentence, mark a page, or suggest returning to the topic later. A specific subject remains available. Even then, we need not promise an eventual return. Interests change, and yesterday’s important question can lose its force. Not every unfinished thought is a debt that must be paid to preserve an image of ourselves as attentive people.

Wonder can then stop competing with tiredness and busyness. It becomes an opportunity we sometimes take. One day, a person walks past a courtyard. Another day, they notice a tree’s shadow falling differently and ask why. Both days belong to one life. We need not call the second authentic and the first wasted. It is enough to let the world occasionally exceed our usual short description of it.

10. The world after one good question

Return to the zipper. Suppose you find a clear diagram and can now explain the basic principle. Your jacket has not become a symbol of the universe. The morning’s tasks remain. Perhaps only one thing has changed: between your hand’s movement and the familiar object, a connection has become understandable. That is a small result. It needs no exaggeration to be real and sufficient for today’s interest.

Elsewhere, the result may be a clearer boundary. You discover that a question about an acquaintance’s behavior cannot be settled without conversation. Available documents cannot

support a confident historical account. Two readings of a work differ because their starting assumptions differ. Inquiry does not always supply an answer. Sometimes it maps the known and unknown more accurately, helping us distinguish desired clarity from clarity actually achieved.

It is easy to describe this ability too grandly, as though someone escapes habit once and begins seeing everything afresh. We need much less: to notice particular moments when a familiar phrase no longer helps, to avoid defending it merely because it is familiar, to find an appropriate check, and to allow an answer unlike the one expected. This is a repeatable action, not a permanent new personal status.

Questions can also connect people. One notices something odd; another knows a detail; a third suggests checking a source. Nobody has to perform omniscience. In a productive conversation, missing knowledge becomes a shared task. Cooperation does not require matching feelings: one person is fascinated, another simply helps. Understanding together needs neither synchronized delight nor agreement about how important the subject ought to be.

Not every moment of wonder or every answer becomes significant. Sometimes attention does change a next step: we speak more precisely, ask more considerately, rely on knowledge more confidently, or acknowledge its limits more calmly. The familiar world remains familiar, but our names no longer seem to exhaust it. We can live without continuous investigation and still sometimes notice a place to ask: what, exactly, is happening here?

What this means in practice

Try a brief inquiry into one familiar object or situation. This is an invitation to reflect, not a validated method with a promised effect. Choose a quiet moment and something that requires neither hazardous action nor intrusion into another person’s life. A fold in paper, a familiar phrase, or the arrangement of a room will do. There is no need to dismantle electrical equipment or test someone’s patience for the exercise.

First, describe only what you noticed: “On this page, I struggle to find the next paragraph.” Then write your explanation: “Perhaps the spaces between lines and paragraphs are too similar.” You already have two elements, an observation and a hypothesis. Keep them alongside each other without treating the hypothesis as an established cause. If the subject does not interest you, choose another or stop here.

Now formulate one answerable question. Instead of “Why is the design bad?” try “What change would make the paragraphs easier to distinguish?” Consider an appropriate source or comparison. Here, two versions of the layout might help. Elsewhere, you may need

instructions, an educational explanation, or a conversation with someone knowledgeable. A clear and proportionate next step matters more than an impressive one.

After checking, return to your first account. What held up? What changed? Is the explanation still a hypothesis? Finish with one accurate sentence: “I now understand the basic principle,” “This part needs clarification,” or “For my task, this is enough information.” A beautiful conclusion is optional. Preserve the actual result, even if it is limited and less impressive than you initially expected.

If you want to discuss the discovery, include how the question changed. That leaves the other person room to check it, and you room to be mistaken without defending a whole story about your insight. You can also keep it to yourself. Sometimes the entire journey takes minutes and ends with a familiar thing becoming slightly clearer. For one encounter with the world, that may be enough.

Connections between approaches

Approach	What it helps distinguish	Limit of application
Plato	Perplexity can open a philosophical question	The dialogue does not describe every person or kind of wonder
Aristotle	Inquiry moves toward explaining causes	Understanding need not preserve the initial feeling
Descartes	A pause before judgment and the risk of excessive wonder	Seventeenth-century philosophy does not replace modern psychology
Rozenblit and Keil	Judging one’s knowledge differs from attempting an explanation	Device tasks and limited samples
Gruber and colleagues	Interest in answers relates to memory in the studied setting	Abstract and captions only; no promise of a general effect

Primary sources and research

1. Plato. Theaetetus. Translated by Benjamin Jowett. The exchange about Theaetetus’ perplexity and philosophy’s beginning was consulted, not the complete dialogue. Philosophical primary source in translation.

2. Aristotle. Metaphysics, Book I, Part 2. Translated by W. D. Ross. The passage on wonder, causes, and the change following explanation was consulted. Philosophical primary source in translation.

3. René Descartes. The Passions of the Soul, 1649. Adapted English version, Early Modern Texts. Articles 53 and 75–76 were consulted; a historical philosophical account.

4. Leonid Rozenblit and Frank Keil. The misunderstood limits of folk science: an illusion of explanatory depth. Cognitive Science, 26, 521–562, 2002. The problem statement, methods, and results for studies 1–2 were consulted, not the complete series of 12 studies. DOI: 10.1207/s15516709cog2605_1.

5. Matthias J. Gruber, Bernard D. Gelman, and Charan Ranganath. States of curiosity modulate hippocampus-dependent learning via the dopaminergic circuit. Neuron, 84(2), 486–496, 2014. Abstract and figure captions in PubMed were consulted; full methods and sample size were not checked. Neural mechanisms are not summarized here. DOI: 10.1016/j.neuron.2014.08.060.

Tags

Wonder · curiosity · questions · understanding · habit · philosophy · education · attention · intellectual humility · Meaning and the Path

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 the principles of unity and mutual understanding work in real life between people and cultures. Instagram: @ilkutki.