

UNITED WISDOM

Stoic Anticipation: Conditional Intention Instead of Endless Rehearsal

Freedom and Action

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

A-02-N04 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Stoic Anticipation: Conditional Intention Instead of Endless Rehearsal

Epigraph

> *Some purpose*

Seneca, *Of Peace of Mind*, XII, a short fragment of his requirement for work, in Aubrey Stewart's English translation. It concerns the grounds of an occupation rather than a promise to predict the future. The context read.

What this article is about

An obstacle can be considered for the sake of a particular action. Possible obstacles can also be rehearsed without obtaining new information or changing any decision. Both occupations seem to concern the future, but their subjects differ. The first clarifies an intention and the conditions of carrying it out; the second sometimes preserves only a need for certainty that present information cannot provide. The distinction does not require declaring every worry mistaken or measuring a person by their calm. In Seneca's selected sections XII–XIII, we will examine the connection between purpose, duty and a conditional result. We then bring this limited question into an explicitly hypothetical scene of returning a borrowed book. This is philosophical reasoning, rather than a clinical account or a method guaranteed to reduce anxiety. A new obstacle may require fresh consideration; the absence of an imagined obstacle does not confirm that an obligation has already been fulfilled.

I. The future is not a single subject of thought

Suppose someone has promised to return a book to an acquaintance on an agreed day. They need to clarify where to hand it over and whether the recipient is available. They may consider beforehand what they will do if the meeting time changes. This is a small voluntary agreement; the scene describes no actual person and establishes no rules for dangerous journeys, specialist duties or a legal dispute. Its usefulness lies in making distinctions visible: there is an object, another person's expectation, our own action and conditions that are not determined by the sender's wish alone.

The question about the future initially seems general: will everything work out? But it can be separated into questions. Is the handover location known? Has the acquaintance agreed to the time? What was promised: returning the book on this particular day, or getting in touch to clarify arrangements? Different actions depend on the answers. Checking a message is not

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

forecasting every circumstance. It may provide sufficient information for the present step while leaving other questions open. The usefulness of consideration therefore cannot be inferred solely from how far ahead someone looked or how many adverse events they could name.

Sometimes a new possibility concerns the task: the recipient has already said they may be late. Sometimes it merely repeats an uncertainty already acknowledged: nobody can promise the absence of every change. These cases call for different decisions. The first may need clarification. In the second, another detailed story about delay will not necessarily change the action. We do not declare such repetition a diagnosis. We ask whether the present reflection adds grounds for a decision or merely reproduces a question to which available information cannot yet give a final answer.

The subject therefore needs naming before an exercise is assessed. Preparing to return the book, trying to obtain calm and wanting to prove reliability are different tasks, although they may arise together. One must not silently replace another. If someone says they are checking the time while actually awaiting a promise never to be disappointed, any answer will be insufficient. Conditional intention begins with acknowledging a limited question, rather than turning the future into a single examination of personal worth and the ability to foresee everything.

II. An occupation's purpose distinguishes preparation from mere movement

In XII, Seneca contrasts work with a definite subject and disordered busyness. He describes people moving among others' affairs without deciding why they are going. This is moral criticism of a way of life in an ancient text, rather than a clinical classification of contemporary behaviour. We do not apply his harsh descriptions to the reader. The limited question matters here: what does the present occupation serve? Movement itself, tiredness or a large collection of details cannot establish that an action had a worthy and attainable purpose.

In the hypothetical scene, that purpose may be the agreed return of an object. Information about the recipient's availability then concerns the task. A detailed list of every possible reason for their absence may no longer be needed. The difference is not the number of lines or a requirement that good reflection be brief. Sometimes a complex task needs lengthy consideration. The difference lies in the connection between information and decision: what exactly could we do differently after learning the answer? If there is no connection, this should be acknowledged, rather than justifying the collection of details solely because it took considerable effort.

The purpose also needs assessment. Someone can prepare carefully to justify breaking a promise or to transfer responsibility in advance. Organisation does not make such preparation morally sufficient. At the beginning of XII, Seneca places failure beside attainment of a result that later becomes a source of shame. This enables a distinction between an occupation's effectiveness and the worth of its subject. Our editorial application is limited: before improving a plan, we need to consider what action it supports and which relationships it changes. Accurate calculation does not replace that question.

Ending a purposeless rehearsal therefore need not mean abandoning preparation. Someone may finish one occupation and perform another: check the agreed message, prepare the book for handover or honestly acknowledge that the present time is unavailable to them. Each step has its subject. They may still feel worried. The article does not make calm evidence of a correct choice. An action's appropriateness is examined through its grounds, availability and relation to existing promises; an inner feeling may accompany the decision without becoming the sole judge of all preparation.

III. A conditional result does not cancel a definite intention

In XIII, Seneca presents intentions whose fulfilment depends on the absence of an obstacle. He speaks of sailing, office and the affairs of his historical world. These are not contemporary recommendations on travel, careers or finance. The form matters to the argument: someone intends an action while leaving room for a circumstance that may prevent it. That room does not make the wish nonexistent. It separates intention from confidence that an external result is already secured by the decision itself. The historical ideal of the sage in the subsequent explanation remains an ideal, rather than our measure of the reader's maturity.

Someone can intend to return the book while acknowledging that handover depends on another person's availability. This differs from a vague wish to do something useful someday. The intention retains its subject and present step. The object can be prepared and the time agreed without assigning the recipient a duty to be present regardless of their circumstances. A conditional result is thus compatible with definite personal participation. It gives no permission to describe handover as completed before actual confirmation, and does not require every statement to be so cautious that the promise loses intelligible content.

The condition nevertheless needs honest understanding. If a participant has long known they cannot come, they may not hide that knowledge behind a general possibility of obstruction. An uncertain future does not turn a known present limit into chance. What is known needs communicating. Otherwise the conditional formula becomes a way to preserve an appearance of readiness that does not exist. Distinguishing an unknown obstacle from established unavailability protects another person from having to plan using information deliberately left more favourable than the actual situation.

The opposite mistake is demanding a promise that obstacles will be absent before an intention counts as serious. Such a demand exceeds the possibilities of an ordinary agreement. Reliability can be considered through available actions performed, truthful communications and reconsideration of conditions when new information arrives. It does not require power over every event. Yet the article does not promise that this will suffice for every participant's trust. The recipient may judge differently. An action's moral grounds and the trust actually produced are connected, but do not become a single result someone can appoint for themselves in advance.

IV. A known obstacle needs a decision, rather than a reservation alone

Suppose the acquaintance says the agreed time is no longer available. The obstacle has now ceased to be one imagined option. New information has arrived, and the former plan needs reconsideration. Another available form of handover can be explored where that discussion is appropriate. A new date can be agreed. The former arrangement cannot continue to be described as though the message changed nothing. A conditional intention makes sense precisely because it allows a distinction between earlier expectation and present circumstances, rather than because it excuses every instance of inaction beforehand.

Not every alternative is available, however. Leaving the book with a third person requires that person's consent and the owner's permission where relevant. An empty space in the imagination does not establish a suitable participant. If the possibilities are unknown, that gap should be retained. The article establishes no property-storage rules. It considers the moral accuracy of a proposal: an option for which necessary consent has not yet been obtained cannot be called ready. Preparation must consider that other people are not spare parts of our plan to be appointed as needed.

Sometimes new information leaves only a limited action: acknowledging that the former method is unavailable and communicating the need for another decision. This step may look less impressive than a promise to remove the entire difficulty immediately. But it describes the position more accurately. An excessive new scope need not be created merely to preserve an image of foresight. A participant may hear that an option has not yet been found. Useful consideration permits incompleteness where information really is insufficient; a confident tone adds no missing resources and does not replace agreement.

A reservation therefore differs from a response to change. The reservation retains the possibility of an obstacle. The response establishes what can and must now be considered in connection with it. A general statement about circumstances is insufficient if it is already known that someone expects an arrangement that will not happen. Notification,

reconsideration of a promise or acknowledgment of our part in the delay may be needed. Not every step is immediately available, but its absence must not be called completion. The article retains this distinction without making failure proof of moral inferiority or making conditionality a universal excuse.

V. Duty limits the right to reduce an occupation

In XIII, reducing unnecessary business is not an unconditional rule. Seneca distinguishes needless busyness from activity to which a serious duty calls us. We retain that qualification: limiting thought about the future does not automatically mean ceasing to consider others' interests. In the hypothetical scene, a promise already made matters even if preparation has become unpleasant. The question cannot be reduced to which occupation produces greater calm. What was actually promised, what change is known and who is affected by a possible delay or refusal to perform need consideration.

Yet calling something a duty is insufficient. Someone may assume they must ensure that nobody experiences inconvenience, although no such promise was made and no such ability exists. This expansion should be distinguished from a specific obligation to return an object or report a delay. Otherwise an attempt to respect an agreement becomes a demand to govern another person's entire life. The article establishes no final list of duties. It proposes examining the content of a present obligation before declaring endless rehearsal of future troubles a necessary expression of care and every limit proof of irresponsibility.

An existing obligation may require more effort than desired. But this gives no permission to ignore a threat, physical unavailability or a need for specialist assistance. Philosophical reasoning does not replace an appropriate decision in these circumstances. If the former scope can no longer be fulfilled, communicating the change where possible matters. Acknowledging a resource limit differs from an obligation silently disappearing. It allows discussion of an available form of participation while preserving the information that the original condition was not met. Nobody can be required to invent an ability merely because acknowledging a limit is unpleasant.

The boundary of consideration consequently has two sides. Work without a subject should not be created, but neither should it be ended solely for a convenient inner state when a known significant message remains. Sometimes preparation is completed by that message. Sometimes an answer must be awaited, and sometimes the present step has already been performed. These cases cannot be distinguished by an occupation's duration or the intensity of worry. They are distinguished by the promise's content, available information and relation to another person's action. Conditional intention keeps obligations visible even when the result remains open.

VI. Repeating a scenario needs fresh grounds

Someone may again imagine the meeting not taking place. The question is not whether they have a right to think about it once more. That right remains. The question concerns the purpose of the present repetition: has new information arrived, has an available decision changed, or does a necessary check remain? If none has happened, more details may not bring performance closer. This is limited reasoning about the work of thought, rather than a claim that every repetition is harmful. The reader need not recognise themselves in the scene or assess their ability to stop worrying.

The examination does not require calculating the likelihood of every misfortune. Our initial information contains no statistics, and we will not invent them. A simple uncertainty can be acknowledged: the time is agreed, but change is possible. This position will not disappear after another story. Nor does it mean that change must occur. Distinguishing a possibility from a fact keeps present action available. A supposed obstacle is not a message from the recipient; imagining their displeasure confirms neither displeasure nor a need immediately to repair a relationship that has not yet changed.

Sometimes fresh consideration is justified: an error in a message is found, an answer arrives or someone realises they described their promise incorrectly. The new grounds then matter, rather than prohibiting thought because of an earlier decision to stop. A boundary is not a ban on change. It concerns present information and the task. It can be reconsidered in a new situation. This allows reasonable flexibility to be distinguished from returning endlessly to one question, and does not make every stopping point a promise never to return to the question.

Uncertainty may remain after consideration has ended. It does not automatically prove that the work was insufficient. If the purpose was to agree a time, the answer can be checked by its content. If the purpose was the complete absence of worry, an ordinary agreement cannot secure that result. Returning to the initial subject is useful here. A feeling need not be declared wrong or forcibly suppressed. The present step can be acknowledged as performed while emotion remains. These two statements are compatible; neither must erase the other for the description to be truthful.

VII. Anticipation does not turn an obstacle into a desired outcome

Allowing an obstacle does not mean preferring it. Someone may wish to return the book on time without denying a possible delay. These relationships to the future are compatible. In the selected XIII, the sage is not removed from human circumstances; the reasoning concerns their relationship to expectation. We do not turn the assertion about reduced pain into a required contemporary result. An obstacle may remain unpleasant even when anticipated. A philosophical ideal gives no grounds for accusing a participant of incorrect preparation merely because they feel disappointed.

An unwanted result must not be produced to demonstrate steadfastness either. If handover is available and agreed, there is no reason to disrupt it to test independence from success. The moral meaning of conditionality lies in honest attention to an obstacle's possibility, rather than creating the obstacle. Preparation remains directed towards appropriate performance. This distinction preserves the intention's practical seriousness: failure does not become the goal, and success does not become proof of power over all circumstances. A good result can be accepted without declaring it an inevitable consequence of personal foresight.

When an obstacle actually occurs, it needs describing within the information known. Not every delay is a momentous defeat, but neither is every delay insignificant to the recipient. A specific inconvenience can be acknowledged without inventing an entire future history of the relationship. Such acknowledgment does not require immediate reconciliation. The other person may remain displeased, and their response should not be appropriated beforehand. Conditional intention permits action after obstruction, but does not issue advance permission to declare every consequence exhausted by an attractive statement about accepting circumstances.

Accepting a possibility and correcting an available consequence therefore need not be opposed. If the sender forgot to agree the time, they can acknowledge their omission. The possibility of human error does not make that omission someone else's responsibility. If the obstruction was actually beyond their influence, it can be reported without invented self-condemnation. Both cases require facts about the specific action. General speech about inevitable uncertainty must not obscure the distinction between an error, a known boundary and a new external change that the parties have only just discovered.

VIII. The limit of preparation belongs to the decision itself

For a small agreement, it may sometimes be possible to identify preparation as finished after checking the significant message and performing our own available step. This is no universal time limit or rule for complex work. The boundary depends on the subject. In our scene, it may differ from a professional task with specialist requirements. The article does not replace those requirements. It discusses the right not to expand voluntary consideration to every imaginable event when the present question has narrower content and known information has already been considered.

The limit is better described through action than through feeling alone. Otherwise preparation ends only after complete calm, which nobody promised. We can check whether an answer was received, our own step is clear and an established inconsistency remains. If there is no answer yet, awaiting it can remain awaiting it. It need not be portrayed as a decision. If a necessary clarification is currently unavailable, precisely that circumstance can be named. Incomplete certainty forces neither an invented confirmation nor automatic continuation of rehearsal without a subject.

Stopping may be accompanied by moving to another task or resting where appropriate. But the article prescribes no method of distraction and does not promise that switching will change a feeling. Sometimes a question is simply left open until an answer arrives. Accuracy of status matters here: a prepared book has not yet been returned; an agreed time does not confirm future presence; a clarification sent is not a new condition accepted. Different stages should not be merged into one favourable outcome to make it easier to stop thinking about the task.

The limit may later be reconsidered when genuinely new information arrives. This does not invalidate the earlier stopping point, which rested on earlier information. Honest reconsideration describes a change, rather than requiring self-justification before an ideal of someone who decides once and forever. In this sense, conditional intention preserves continuity through changes: the subject and moral grounds remain visible although the form of performance is clarified. Such continuity differs both from stubborn pursuit of an unavailable plan and from arbitrary changes of purpose for every new impression.

IX. After an event, the result differs from the earlier grounds

Suppose the book was handed over. Success does not prove that every former assumption was correct or that sufficient foresight was exercised. Some information may have been mistaken while the result still occurred. The outcome therefore needs describing without attaching excessive meaning: the object has been returned and the present obligation fulfilled in the part confirmed. Any new questions have their own grounds. Fortune should not be used as evidence that the same method will now secure every future action and that every doubt will be unnecessary.

If handover did not occur, that does not automatically establish an empty intention either. What the participant did, which condition changed and which communication remains necessary need distinguishing. A personal mistake is possible; agreement may have been unavailable; an event unknown to both parties beforehand may have occurred. These possibilities differ and should not be mixed into a general verdict. Disappointment may remain in any case. It matters as an experience, but alone cannot say which part of action needs correction or whether a new promise is possible at all.

Limited subsequent consideration then concerns present consequences. Who needs to hear that the book has not yet been returned? Is a new agreement available? Was inaccurate information given that should be clarified? This is no longer the former future scenario, but work with a change that has occurred. It may take time. If it cannot be completed immediately, incompleteness should be retained. An absence of further inconvenience must not be promised where such a promise is impossible. Acknowledging an error and removing it completely remain different events, even when one wants to merge them.

Reading the result in this way preserves dignity without self-justification. Someone is not reducible to one success or delay, but their specific action remains open to assessment. Effort can be acknowledged while an insufficient check is discovered. An unfavourable outcome can be acknowledged while retaining information about truthful performance of the available part. These distinctions require no single assessment of the whole person. They allow learning from a particular event without making it proof of perfection or an indefinite verdict on personal inability to act in a world of changing conditions.

X. Intention remains active in an open future

The selected XII–XIII join three questions: what an occupation serves, whether a duty calls us to it and whether an intention allows an obstacle. This is a connection within a philosophical argument, rather than a measured method of managing experience. Our limited application retains it in an ordinary agreement: define the subject, consider an available action, acknowledge the unknown and communicate significant change. The reader need not imitate the historical sage or reach a special state before fulfilling a promise. Conditionality concerns the result, rather than the right to regard a particular present action as real.

Endless rehearsal does not become foresight merely because it describes difficulties. Nor does a brief stopping point become reasonable merely because it reduces work. Both need grounds. New information, necessary consent and an outstanding message may require continuation; repeating uncertainty already acknowledged may create no new subject. This examination leaves room for voluntary change and refusal of an unsuitable exercise. It does not turn the ability to stop into a duty whose violation establishes an absence of moral discipline or of the right to seek assistance.

The future remains open even when a decision is definite enough for the present step. A possible obstacle does not cancel a truthful promise's value; a truthful promise does not cancel a possible obstacle. Human action remains between them: prepare what is available, assign no unknown duties to others, reconsider conditions when they change and distinguish performance from expectation. In this limited form, anticipation does not require possession of an entire future history. It helps ask what we intend to do now and on what grounds we retain that intention.

What this means in practice

Where appropriate, choose one small voluntary agreement. Do not use a dangerous situation or work requiring a specialist protocol for the exercise. The note can be skipped or stopped. Name the subject and one available present step; separately identify what depends on another person's consent or an unknown condition. Do not turn a supposed obstacle into a report that it has already occurred.

Then check whether a significant clarification remains that is currently available. If it does, consider its appropriateness. If the answer is still unknown, retain that status. Identify limited grounds for fresh consideration: a participant's answer, an established error or an actual change of condition. Every possible occasion need not be listed beforehand, and you need not promise yourself the absence of worry after the note.

Check that stopping does not hide a known message on which another person's step depends. A narrow possible result is a clearer distinction between intention, available performance and open conditions. Success, calm and approval are not guaranteed. In a threat, a serious condition or a specialist duty, the philosophical exercise does not replace appropriate support; it may be stopped.

Key quotation

> *Some resistance*

Seneca, *Of Peace of Mind*, XIII, a short fragment of his own explanation of a possible obstacle to intention, in Aubrey Stewart's translation. It concerns neither the desirability of failure nor exemption from human circumstances. The context read.

Connections between traditions

Question	Sources read	Comparison	Boundary
The subject of preparation	Seneca, Of Peace of Mind XII	An occupation's definite purpose differs from disordered movement alone.	Moral criticism in an ancient text is not a contemporary clinical classification.
Conditionality and duty	Seneca, XIII; our hypothetical book handover	A possible obstacle does not erase the subject or a known obligation.	An editorial application, rather than an ancient protocol for contemporary property handover.

No interreligious identity or historical borrowing is asserted; the map is limited to the argument read and the identified example.

Primary sources

1. **Seneca. Of Peace of Mind / De Tranquillitate Animi, XII–XIII.** Aubrey Stewart's English version, *Minor Dialogues Together with the Dialogue on Clemency*, George Bell and Sons, 1889; Wikisource presentation. The selected XII–XIII were read in full; the introductory distinction between Serenus's speech and Seneca's reply was checked separately. No complete reading of the entire collection is claimed here. Text. The public-domain indication concerns the United States; universal rights are unconfirmed. No full import is made. Historical examples and claims about the ideal sage are not evidence of contemporary psychological effects.

Tags

Stoicism, Seneca, peace of mind, anticipation, intention, conditionality, obstacle, purpose, preparation, duty, promise, agreement, consent, uncertainty, future, action, limit, repetition, reflection, information, responsibility, change, performance, result, error, correction, dignity, moral philosophy, expectation, independence

About the authors

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

Maria Evilkut is a coauthor 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.