

UNITED WISDOM

The Professional Mask and Private Life

The Person and the Inner World

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

I-02-N03 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

The Professional Mask and Private Life

Epigraph

> *“which we assume by our own deliberate choice”*

Cicero, De Officiis I.115: a fragment concerning the fourth role in his account of four roles, in Walter Miller’s English translation. Not every role in this account is chosen.

What this article is about

At work, someone speaks precisely, allows pauses, leaves some feelings unexpressed, and answers questions within their task. At home, the same manner can be useful or inappropriate. The difference alone does not reveal a real person behind an act or establish deception. Professional form, claims to knowledge, personal disclosure, and availability outside work are separate subjects. Through an invented editor’s case, we consider Cicero’s four roles, William James’s social images, Aristotle’s truthfulness in company, and the Gospel question of whom a public action addresses. These sources form no single psychological model. They help identify what a mask does: support a task, create an unsupported impression, or transfer a working arrangement where people expected different participation. Private life does not require identical behavior everywhere, and honesty is not equivalent to publicly describing every inner experience. The particular action and the relationship in which it occurs still need examination.

I. When a familiar form no longer suits a conversation

Imagine Lev, an editor at a small publishing house. The person and situation are invented. At work, noticing ambiguity, clarifying terms, and distinguishing the important from the unnecessary are useful. Authors want clear comments; his restrained manner helps keep every correction from becoming a personal dispute. That evening, a friend tells him about a trip. Lev starts correcting imprecise expressions and asking her to place events in sequence. She explains that she wanted to share an experience, not prepare a publication. He genuinely considered his questions useful. The mismatch emerged between two tasks understood differently within one conversation, rather than between a good person and a bad one.

The word mask can immediately suggest accusation, as if composure necessarily concealed insincerity. Yet professional form can make participation predictable. An author needs to know what is unclear in a paragraph rather than guess the editor’s mood. Lev can feel irritated and still formulate a respectful comment. Declining to transmit every feeling is not itself a lie. A different question concerns whether he claims to have read something unread, know something unknown, or completed a promise unfulfilled. This tests a claim’s content.

Combining the questions can produce a demand for complete emotional disclosure while allowing significant deception about the work itself to pass unnoticed. More openness does not automatically supply more accurate information.

It therefore helps to identify which form was unsuitable and what it usually serves. Precision may hinder an informal account of a trip but matter again when arranging a meeting date. His friend need not accept every correction; Lev need not abandon attentiveness forever. They can clarify whether they want a story, advice, or a practical decision. This is our contemporary analysis, not a measured relationship intervention. Its subject is specific: what one person offered and what the other expected in this encounter. From one mismatch, we infer neither Lev's hidden character nor the inevitable course of his private life. The conversation supplies grounds for a narrower question.

II. Cicero: different grounds of a role

In the selected De Officiis I.107–121, Cicero distinguishes four aspects of someone's role. Two concern shared rational humanity and individual characteristics; two further roles concern circumstances and deliberate choice. His discussion addresses appropriate behavior and duty, not modern personality testing. The epigraph concerns the fourth, deliberately assumed role. It does not mean that origin, social position, and every available occupation are freely chosen. This distinction prevents a profession from being compressed into one description. It can involve abilities, circumstances, a choice made, and the requirements of an activity. Each can contribute to someone's working position without all having the same origin or being equally open to change.

Lev may have chosen editing because he loves language. His present responsibilities may also reflect an available vacancy, the publisher's decisions, and the need for income. Some ways of speaking were developed deliberately; others were adopted to enter the work more readily. Calling all this one mask makes possible changes difficult to identify. He can retain his profession while no longer editing private conversations. He can clarify his field or learn another action. He can wish to change occupation and encounter substantial constraints. Each decision concerns a different aspect of the role. Distinguishing their grounds allows change to be discussed without imagining either complete freedom or a person wholly produced by circumstance.

Cicero compares actors with parts that suit them and also considers labor devoted to difficult performance. We do not adopt his concept of nature as a measured, unchangeable modern personality type. What matters here is that a suitable role and its demands require consideration. Loving precision can help an editor without making precision the sole form of participation with close companions. Respect for another person need not vanish as a situation changes; a working requirement may remain limited to its task. Private action becomes clearer

when someone identifies which habitual arrangements they genuinely want to retain and which they apply by inertia, without checking what the people involved expect.

III. Several social images need not mean deception

In the Social Self passage of The Principles of Psychology Chapter X, James considers recognition by different groups. He allows both conflicting divisions of social images and harmonious divisions of labor. This historical conceptual discussion supplies no basis for diagnosing someone who behaves differently across settings. Colleagues may know Lev as a strict reader, friends as a walker, and a music teacher as a beginner. These facts need not contradict one another. Editorial competence creates no musical ability, while inexperience in a new activity cancels no completed editorial work. A contradiction requires claims that concern the same subject and cannot both be true. Difference between domains is not enough.

Different expression can also be appropriate. At a work meeting, Lev lists questions briefly; with a friend, he tells a lengthy story; in a lesson, he requests another demonstration. He need not preserve one tone to prove uninterrupted authenticity. Different audiences, however, may be unaware of his limits and attribute a wider competence than he possesses. A professional image can then become a source of error. If friends assume an editor understands every language, Lev can clarify his field. He need not list every language unknown to him, but a particular approach requires an honest answer about whether he can perform the proposed task. The specific request makes the relevant limit identifiable.

Cicero’s four roles should not become four Jamesian social selves. One account considers grounds of appropriate action, the other recognition by different groups. Their difference is useful: a chosen profession and colleagues’ impression are not identical. Lev can change his work while an audience remembers its earlier form, or retain an occupation while his interest shifts. Private life brings another audience, not a new obligation to forget every professional skill. Instead of searching for one final mask, we can identify what changed: the task, people, claimed knowledge, manner of expression, or availability. A particular mismatch then gains a subject instead of absorbing an entire biography into one description.

IV. When competence is extended too far

Professional form often makes knowledge visible: someone identifies the main issue quickly, asks a precise question, and uses familiar terminology. Form alone creates no competence in a new subject. Lev edits familiar texts; this does not establish an ability to evaluate an unfamiliar source or specialized assertion. In private conversation, his confident tone may remain unchanged while its grounds have altered. A listener may struggle to see the difference unless it is named. The mask question therefore also concerns the impression created: is someone reporting knowledge, or allowing a manner of speaking to present a conjecture as a checked answer? Similar delivery can carry claims supported in very different ways.

In Nicomachean Ethics IV.7, Aristotle examines truthfulness concerning qualities someone attributes to themselves: more, less, or what they actually have. He also discusses boasting for honor and advantage, including difficult-to-check expertise. This is an ethical argument, not a modern qualification procedure. Applied here, it asks which quality is claimed. “I usually work with texts like these” differs from “I checked this source.” One reports experience, the other a completed action. Experience can make checking possible without replacing it. A truthful presentation preserves the distinction between what someone can do and what they have done. It also lets another person understand what remains unexamined before relying on the statement.

Professional confidence can accompany acknowledgment of a limit. Lev can explain which question he understands and where another specialist is needed. This need not abandon his editorial position. Sometimes division enables the work to continue: he can examine an argument’s structure while its specialized content needs separate checking. Yet a private conversation partner can decide whether this analysis is wanted now. If the request was to hear a story, allocation of expert functions may miss its point. Precision must concern the encounter as well as knowledge: what task are both participants willing to accept, and is an expert answer required at all? The role’s presence does not determine that answer in advance.

V. Truthfulness and the completeness of a personal account

Aristotle explicitly qualifies the selected discussion by excluding the justice of agreements and situations covered by that virtue. This matters to our application. His truthful person provides no complete list of professional duties, nor an obligation to tell every listener everything. A truthful claim and complete disclosure are different questions. Lev can report that he will not accept another manuscript today without listing his evening's private circumstances. If he offers no false explanation and clearly identifies available action, missing details do not automatically make the message deceptive. Any special duty requires separate consideration of the particular undertaking. The ancient ethical description does not settle every present requirement for information.

Combining these questions can burden both sides. An author may believe that an honest editor must display every doubt. Lev may believe that respectful refusal requires his entire personal history. Sometimes the recipient needs only a fact, date, and next step. Excessive explanation can obscure a decision if it leaves completion timing unclear. In another conversation, the personal story matters because the relationship itself is being discussed. Disclosure then follows another task and both people's agreement. A single universal measure of openness misses these differences. An honest working reply and an intimate conversation can differ in content while remaining compatible. Neither must duplicate the other to make the person recognizable.

Privacy does not, however, justify concealing a fact relevant to the undertaking. If Lev promises a manuscript by a certain day while knowing this is impossible, the question concerns the promise's reality rather than entitlement to a personal account. He can retain reasons within chosen limits while reporting a changed date. This distinction is our application; Aristotle is not presented as a current privacy law. Two questions can remain separate: what information does another person need to decide about the shared undertaking, and what private information do I choose to disclose? Their answers may overlap, but cannot be declared identical beforehand. Relevant information about the work need not encompass its performer's entire life.

VI. What remains meaningful without an audience?

Matthew 6:1–6 concerns almsgiving and prayer. Action before people for their recognition is contrasted with action before the Father who sees in secret. This is religious address, not a psychological formula concerning professional burnout or a rule that every public action is hypocritical. Our comparison asks whom an action addresses and whose view matters to it. James's image among a group and the Gospel relation to the Father rest on different grounds. They cannot be combined as though the divine witness were another working audience. Their difference nevertheless shows that the absence of professional spectators need not, by itself, remove the content of a private action. What matters must still be identified.

Lev can study music without wanting to display another achievement to colleagues. He can help an acquaintance read a letter without making assistance evidence of indispensability. These invented actions are not paraphrases of Gospel prayer or almsgiving. They illustrate our question: must every activity sustain a public professional image? If a walk becomes material for a presentation and every meeting an opportunity to demonstrate expertise, the professional stage expands. Accusation of vanity need not precede examination. Work and personal interest might genuinely be connected. The question concerns a particular choice and what happens when a professional spectator stops being a necessary condition of that activity's value. The answer is not fixed by its visibility alone.

A religious reader may consider private action through a relation to God; another reader may consider its specific recipient or the activity itself. Their grounds are not declared identical. The comparison opens a question without requiring belief or a shared answer. Lev can distinguish absent spectators from absent meaning. An evening lesson can matter as learning even when nobody knows about it. Conversation can matter to a friend without producing an editorial result. Public work can also have genuine content. Choosing something private proves no insincerity in public action. Address and activity need examination rather than judgment through visibility alone. Different reasons can remain intelligible without being reduced to one another.

VII. Moving between roles involves coordination

Private life need not begin the instant a work file closes. A habitual response can persist, and new participants may expect its continuation. Lev's friend can want an opinion about a text, and Lev can offer assistance. The problem arises when editing begins without discussion although another kind of participation was wanted. A question can mark the transition: would you like comments on the wording, or is telling the story what matters now? This should not become an examination for the recipient. It makes an offer intelligible. Sometimes the answer is already present in the request, and hearing it is enough. Ordinary encounters need not all acquire an additional procedure.

Professional skills can also be affected in the other direction: private expectations influence a working decision. If a friend brings a manuscript, Lev may want to preserve a warm impression and avoid substantive comments. An accepted task can then conflict with wanting to please. A response need not become cold or personal. They can clarify whether the offer is a friendly impression, professional editing, or a brief answer to one question. Each has its scope and possibility of refusal. A role's title replaces no agreement about this particular work. The friend needs to know what result is offered before building further plans on it and assuming a more extensive contribution.

Availability has a separate measure too. Someone can retain competence in the evening while declining new work. A functioning skill does not mean continuing agreement to use it whenever asked. A duty arrangement or other explicit obligation needs separate consideration; our ordinary example specifies none. The absence of a work response at home therefore proves no disappearance of a professional identity. Lev can identify when he will return to the task or explain that he will not accept it. Revising availability need not include every private activity. Where someone relies on confirmed participation, however, the change should be reported at the scale of that agreement rather than concealed behind a general statement about private life.

VIII. Learning without maintaining an expert’s status

A new activity places the professional mask in a distinctive situation. Lev is experienced in publishing but a beginner in a music lesson. The teacher hears an incorrect movement and asks him to repeat a simple passage. He can receive this as information about an action or hear a verdict on familiar competence. The latter reading supplies no diagnosis, but obscures the subject: a musical error does not assess editorial work. James’s social images preserve differences between audiences and activities. Cicero’s consideration of fitting performance adds the work of undertaking a role rather than simply claiming its title. Neither text guarantees that moving between these positions will be easy. They help identify what is actually being evaluated.

A beginner can truthfully name experience possessed and experience not yet acquired. Some habits from work may help: regularity, attention to sequence, and willingness to revisit corrections. Others may need change: a written paragraph can be reread while a sounded phrase has passed; an editor is familiar with verbal argument while a movement needs trying. These are features of our invented example, not a theory of all learning. An earlier capacity need not disappear for another way of acting to emerge. Someone can use what is available without declaring it sufficient for every task. The transfer requires examination within the particular activity rather than confidence in universally applicable professional experience.

Truthfulness also concerns understatement. Aristotle considers diminution as well as enlargement of attributed qualities, distinguishing its forms. Lev need not prove modesty by denying actual skill. He can be an editor and a novice simultaneously because the descriptions concern different subjects. They do not form incompatible personalities. A precise account gives each activity its measure: here he can assist with an argument; here he is learning to hold a bow. It preserves personal continuity through differences in activity. Private life gains room for experience that need not immediately become another public proof of professional success or its refutation. Learning can have a subject distinct from protecting a reputation in an unrelated field.

IX. When a chosen path needs reconsideration

In De Officiis I.120–121, Cicero allows for an error in choosing an occupation and discusses change, including gradual change. This remains part of his ethics of appropriateness and duty. It establishes neither that every career change helps nor that circumstances allow it without losses. It nevertheless shows that retaining a role need not prohibit reconsideration. Lev can discover that his earlier way of working no longer suits changed tasks. First, he needs to identify what no longer fits: the profession, a position, the scope of participation, or a manner of speaking. These separate subjects are often compressed into a declaration that someone can no longer wear their mask.

If constant availability is the problem, changing profession may not address it. If the work requires knowledge Lev cannot or does not want to acquire, changing evening conversation alone is insufficient. If editing remains important while its organization obstructs it, the question concerns conditions. These distinctions do not automatically create available alternatives. Income, obligations, and opportunities to learn remain real circumstances. They make a decision proportionate to the difficulty identified. Instead of declaring the whole earlier life false, someone can name the part of the role requiring change. Other abilities, relationships, and completed work do not thereby become nonexistent or devoid of value. Reconsidering one component need not erase the rest of a history.

James allows social differences to be harmonious rather than only conflicting. This promises no harmony from every reconsideration. Its relevance is that a single unmoving form need not be demanded throughout life. Someone can report a new scope to colleagues, altered timing to companions, and a chosen next step to themselves. Each recipient needs different information. Change does not require an immediate public report about the entire personality. Where promises already exist, a transition’s arrangements must nevertheless be identified. Gradualness can account for others; it can also conceal indefinite postponement. The difference is established through actions and dates rather than by the mere announcement of a revised path. A description of intention does not complete the transition.

X. Being oneself across different circumstances

We have not uncovered one face beneath the work mask that must always speak identically. Several examinable questions have emerged instead. What is someone doing? What do they claim to know? Whom does their participation address? Which private information do they choose to disclose? What promises already exist? These questions do not replace reflection about oneself; they give it grounds within an event. Lev can speak differently with an author, friend, and music teacher while retaining respect and truthfulness. The action's content allows compatibility to be examined. An identical tone guarantees no honesty, while a different tone alone indicates neither concealed deception nor a fragmented personality. Appearance is not sufficient to settle the distinction.

In private conversation, a professional ability can remain available without automatically determining the encounter's meaning. A friend can request an editorial view or decline it; Lev can offer participation and name its limit. Sometimes they will solve a problem, sometimes share impressions, and sometimes simply spend time together. Each can have content without continually demonstrating expert status. Private space need not be entirely unstructured. It can include agreements, precision, and consideration of consequences. The arrangement is examined through this encounter rather than imported completely from a professional role and declared uniquely correct in advance. Professional experience may contribute while other people's intentions also remain visible. The task is not given by the title alone.

A professional mask becomes open to substantive choice when its functions are distinguishable. Someone retains one form because it helps the task, changes another because it creates an unsupported impression, and limits a third by time or recipient. They can report what matters truthfully while keeping private matters within chosen bounds. An occupation can be reconsidered without canceling completed work; something new can be learned without denying existing experience. These possibilities do not establish a favorable result beforehand. They return the question to available action. Instead of demanding that every mask be removed, we can examine one form, its grounds, and its place so that people in this encounter can understand the offered participation and choose their response to it.

What this means in practice

1. Separate form from claim. Choose an ordinary, nonurgent encounter you are willing to consider. Note which working habit entered it: correcting words, answering briefly, or checking sequence. Separately identify what was claimed about knowledge or completed action. A changed tone and a false assertion require different consideration. One episode need not decide which personality is real. This is a voluntary author-created reflection, not a diagnostic procedure.

2. Clarify whom participation addresses. Consider what both people wanted. Leave the question open where information is absent. If appropriate, ask whether advice, textual checking, or a story without corrections is wanted. You need not send the drafted question; noticing a distinction may reveal the uncertain point. Do not require someone to specify every detail of ordinary conversation in advance or promise that clarification eliminates every mismatch.

3. Name relevant and private information. For an accepted task, distinguish information needed for another's decision from the personal history you choose to share. Report a changed date; explain reasons to an appropriate extent. If no task is accepted, create none for the exercise's sake. This is no tested method for improving private life. It offers a way to consider a particular action while distinguishing competence, truthfulness, and chosen personal space.

Key quotation

> *"perfectly harmonious division of labor"*

William James, The Principles of Psychology, Chapter X, Social Self: a short fragment contrasting conflicting and harmonious divisions of social images. This is a conceptual possibility in James, not a promise of a measured outcome.

Connections between traditions

1. A role's grounds and its audience. Cicero distinguishes common humanity, individual features, circumstances, and choice (I.107, I.115); James distinguishes images among groups (Social Self). This separates professional function from others' impressions. Four personae are not four social selves: a normative composition of duties and social recognition concern different subjects.

2. Truthfulness and different tones. Aristotle examines attributed qualities, neither more nor less than possessed (IV.7); James allows harmonious differences in social images (Social Self). Their comparison shifts attention from identical expression to a claim's content. It establishes no sector-specific duties: the justice of agreements is explicitly outside Aristotle's selected discussion.

3. A fitting role and knowledge's limit. Cicero relates an actor's role to abilities and work (I.114); Aristotle notices exaggerated claims to difficult-to-check expertise (IV.7). The shared question concerns actual skill and an impression created by form. This is no current licensing test or ground for accusing a professional without specific facts.

4. Recognition and action without spectators. James examines social recognition (Social Self); Matthew addresses alms and prayer before the Father who sees in secret (6:1–6). Their comparison asks whom private action addresses. A divine witness is not a professional audience; absent spectators are not adopted as the sole measure of sincerity.

5. Reconsideration and harmonious difference. Cicero allows mistaken choice and gradual occupational change (I.120–121); James distinguishes conflicting and harmonious division (Social Self). A specific transition can be discussed without demanding an unchanging lifelong role. The passages establish no benefit from every career change and cancel none of its material conditions.

6. An honest claim and chosen disclosure. Aristotle considers truthfully describing qualities (IV.7); Matthew distinguishes assistance from display before people (6:1–4). Our application reports professionally relevant facts without requiring a public presentation of an entire personal history. It is no privacy law or excuse for a false promise or concealing a fact needed for shared work.

Primary sources

Cicero. De Officiis I.107–121, Walter Miller's English translation, the 1913 edition in Project Gutenberg. All English text of the selected paragraphs was read, including the continuation on choice and reconsideration. The epigraph concerns the fourth role in I.115; its Russian rendering is ours. No critical Latin collation was undertaken, and severe historical examples were not transferred into contemporary advice.

William James. The Principles of Psychology, Chapter X, original English, 1890, in the Classics in the History of Psychology transcription. We reuse our actual complete reading of the selected Social Self passage during this work, including conflicting and harmonious division. The key quotation is a short original fragment; its Russian rendering is ours. The whole chapter is not claimed as read.

Aristotle. Nicomachean Ethics IV.7, W. D. Ross's English translation. We reuse our actual complete reading of the selected section on truthfulness and overstatement or understatement of qualities. Its qualification concerning the justice of agreements is retained. Modern professional regulations and the Greek original were not examined here.

Matthew. 6:1–6, King James Version. All six selected verses on almsgiving and prayer were read. Their religious addressee is retained; the passage is neither a psychological study of private life nor a general prohibition on public work.

Tags

professional mask, private life, social role, self-image, competence, knowledge, claims, truthfulness, sincerity, personal disclosure, availability, workplace conversation, friendship conversation, audiences, recognition, duties, circumstances, choice, custom, learning, beginners, reconsideration, occupational change, consistency, Cicero, William James, Aristotle, Matthew, ethics, United Wisdom

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.