

UNITED WISDOM

Speaking in the First Person Without a Justifying Preamble

The Person and the Inner World

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

I-18-N01 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Speaking in the First Person Without a Justifying Preamble

Epigraph

> *It is myself I paint.*

Michel de Montaigne, Essays, the author's address to the reader, an English fragment in Hazlitt's 1877 edition. The preface includes qualifications about its subject; it is not presented as a ready-made model of speech without apologies. The particular translator of the restored English address was not established. The Russian fragment is an identified own translation.

What this article is about

Vera writes to her reading group that she does not want to continue the selected novel and proposes another book. Several preliminary lines grow: she is no expert, respects everyone's decision, does not intend to argue, and might have no right to intervene at all. The proposal disappears between proofs of good intentions. Vera has demanded nothing but already requests permission to have a taste and participate in choice. A listener struggles to understand the subject: the next book, her place in the group, or an assessment of whether her voice was sufficiently delicate.

A desire, reaction, or decision can be expressed without first justifying the right to every such report. This does not mean always beginning with "I," abandoning politeness, or making one's version true for everyone. The article distinguishes a statement's subject, needed explanation, a request, and defending one's right to be present in conversation. It diagnoses no individual cause of a preamble. The practical question is what needs saying and which grounds this particular content needs when a general test of the speaker's sufficient goodness is left outside this discussion.

I. The First Person Names Whose Message This Is

Vera can write: "I do not want to continue this novel; I want to suggest another book." Her desire and proposal are named. She is not reporting that the novel is bad for everyone, the group made a mistake, or nobody should read it anymore. A statement's subject has a boundary. The first person marks an answer's author, but the answer still needs understanding. One pronoun does not automatically make a sentence accurate: "I consider you incapable of choosing" assesses other people despite beginning with the same short word.

Different reports need different grounds. Vera might say reading bores her, that she does not understand an episode, or that the text gives an incorrect historical date. The first reports personal experience, the second a limit of understanding, and the third a verifiable assertion about a book. They need not merge into one status of personal truth. The date needs a source; incomprehension can name a passage; for her own desire Vera need not prove that every participant shares it or a recognized specialist approves it.

Speaking for oneself does not mean presenting an entire biography either. Vera can name her relationship to this book now. Whether it remains next year is unknown, and its cause need not immediately be established. She may tell more or retain this scope. A voice does not become authentic only through disclosure of every personal circumstance. A particular statement can be limited without becoming either a final portrait of personality or a promise always to prefer the same kind of reading.

This distinction also spares a listener unnecessary work. When a proposal hides among apologies for an opinion’s existence, others must guess whether to reassure Vera first or discuss the book. Naming the subject directly might facilitate response in our imagined scene. This is neither a universal psychological effect nor a guarantee of successful communication. Someone can still disagree or understand differently. Yet participants receive workable content rather than an indefinite invitation to issue a general verdict on whether Vera appeared sufficiently appropriately in the conversation at all.

The first change can therefore be small. Becoming confident, fearless, or finally self-knowing is unnecessary. Distinguish what belongs to your answer from what is asserted about the world and others. Vera may say she does not yet know which book to suggest but no longer wants to continue this one. That leaves an unknown visible. The group’s entire future programme need not be determined before her relationship to today’s reading becomes an admissible subject of shared discussion.

II. Explaining Content Differs From Justifying the Right to Speak

Some preamble helps. Vera might specify that her book is proposed for the next meeting rather than changing the already scheduled one. That conveys subject and timing. Acknowledging the inconvenience of rescheduling can also concern a real task. Ask what a sentence does. If it clarifies conditions, it need not be removed for an ideal of brevity. If it asks for recognition of sufficient goodness before any content is considered, notice that conversation has acquired another, much less definite subject.

In the Essays’ address to the reader, Montaigne makes himself the book’s subject while qualifying the modesty of its design. We borrow no compulsory introductory form. A literary address and a present-day group message have different tasks and recipients. Comparison

raises an editorial question about words' function rather than proving that a historical author already developed our practice or that his example automatically permits any contemporary remark without explanation or responsibility.

Politeness does not reduce to self-belittlement. Vera can greet the group, acknowledge the organizer's work, and name a proposal clearly. She need not assert that her taste is insignificant or her participation inconveniences everyone else. Yet familiar gentle wording should not be declared weakness by appearance. Cautious words can convey a meaning someone actually wants to preserve in a particular conversation. This article proposes a distinction, rather than a new speech examination where every apology signifies an incorrect relationship to oneself.

"I do not want to offend" sometimes reports intention, sometimes hides an unpleasant judgment, and sometimes reflects a habitual turn of phrase. One expression does not establish its cause. Consider what follows and what the speaker expects. Vera can name a proposed novel directly. If she instead reports that the organizer always chooses poorly written books, removing a preamble will not repair content. Examine the judgment, its grounds, and treatment of the person. Brevity is no sufficient test of respect and frees words from no consequences.

Explanation can follow the main sentence too. Vera first names a preference, then, if relevant to choice, describes her desired reading format. This order is not universally compulsory. It helps examine whether content disappeared inside preparations for permission to say it. Sometimes context should come first; sometimes one report suffices. Choose the form through actual conversation. A voice need not prove independence by rejecting every introduction, thanks, or cautious word that carries substantive meaning for the speaker.

III. A Personal Voice Does Not Appropriate Truth About Others

Imagine another sentence: "It seems to me that you selected this book to show your education." First-person wording does not make the organizer's motive known. This contains an explanation of another person. Specify which action prompted the thought, ask a question, or retain an unconfirmed hypothesis. Personal experience cannot prove another's intention. Vera knows what she felt or thought within her report; that does not establish why someone else actually made a decision.

At the beginning of Emerson's Self-Reliance, self-trust is linked to one's thought and a religious framework of providence. This is normative philosophical speech, rather than empirical assurance of infallibility. Our distinction is separate: naming a position does not make it an established fact about every listener. The contemporary practice below is not derived from Emerson's entire system and does not require his religious premises. Brief grounding retains a question of one's answer while explicitly marking transfer's limits.

Vera can report experience without a hidden assessment: following the plot is difficult, she wants a different pace, or the discussion format does not suit her. That content can be heard even if the organizer does not share the reaction. They can report how the book was chosen and need not agree with an account of their motives. Two reports can stand together. No single story in which one participant is completely right about another must first be established before future arrangements or a reader’s particular preference can be discussed.

Responsibility for facts remains regardless of confident tone. If Vera asserts that a book contains a particular error, a source must address that error. A wrong page number can be corrected. The first person replaces no such check and makes correction no humiliation. A position and the accuracy of particular information have different grounds. Someone can confidently want another novel while being wrong about a cited date. Neither result supplies a complete conclusion about the value of participation in the group.

A personal experience can also be reported uncertainly. Vera is unsure whether she is bored or struggling to follow the plot; she reports precisely that. A final feeling need not be selected to obtain permission to speak. Distinguish observation and explanation without declaring every inner answer immutable and infallible. Such a report remains first-person speech. It also allows clarification without proving that someone previously had no right to speak because current words differ from an initial formulation or disclose further details.

IV. A Request Includes Another Person’s Right to Answer

Proposing another book changes a shared task, so other participants have their own answers. Vera can want new reading without obtaining a majority. Her desire does not disappear, while the group’s decision need not automatically coincide with it. Distinguish having a position from authority to decide for everyone. The first creates no second. Removing a justifying preamble should not quietly turn a report into a demand that others now confirm Vera’s significance by selecting her suggested book for the next meeting.

Name a request through an action. Vera asks to discuss an option at the next gathering or receive an answer by a stated deadline. Someone understands the participation proposed; refusal and clarification remain possible. Specificity guarantees no agreement but differs from asking whether Vera is loved sufficiently to replace the novel. Making personal worth depend on the outcome makes taste differences harder to discuss without moral judgment. Retain the subject: the book, selection time, voting conditions, and actual proposal.

A personal decision needing no action from others can also be reported. Vera will not read further and will attend only to listen if the format allows. This concerns her participation rather than compulsory revision of the shared plan. Yet preparation might be a group condition; compatibility then needs separate discussion. Reporting a decision cancels no agreed meeting

arrangement. It makes mismatch visible instead of promising participation Vera no longer chooses and secretly hoping everyone will guess her present limit.

A listener’s refusal does not always concern message form. The organizer might lack programme room, participants prefer the old book, or rules disallow replacement now. These are possible conditions needing clarification rather than an established reading of reasons. A negative answer need not immediately prompt another apologetic paragraph. Ask about a relevant condition, acknowledge mismatch, or retain a suggestion for later. No word order ensures that shared life always gives a desired answer after a sufficiently direct personal remark.

Both sides’ freedom therefore remains. Vera need not abandon her taste for agreement; others need not accept her taste to prove respect. Participants might compromise or choose different activities. That does not make direct speech useless. It can reveal an actual mismatch that existed earlier too. Yet clarity need not please. This editorial practice promises no harmony; it allows separating a difficult agreement from a general prohibition on having and expressing personal desire in conversation.

V. An Action Can Be Repaired Without Generally Defending a Personality

Vera forgot the promised list of alternative books. An apology can have a particular subject: someone expected material and did not receive it. Abandoning a justifying preamble does not mean refusing to acknowledge an error. Vera can name what was not done and report an actual next step. She need neither declare herself generally bad nor defend her personality through every past good achievement. Responsibility concerns a broken agreement and consequences that really appeared here and need an answer.

If a new deadline cannot be met, a more attractive promise should not conceal that. Vera can report that the selection is not ready and propose that the group choose without her. Others can find the delay inconvenient. That view does not necessarily make her voice generally inadmissible. Yet an inner right to a position does not repair a missing list. Preserve both facts: someone can speak for themselves, and a particular action was not performed. Merging them creates either unnecessary humiliation or hidden avoidance of practical responsibility.

Detailed explanation of delay fits if it resolves a task or conveys wanted information. It need not become payment for acknowledging an error without general condemnation. Vera can name available participation without disclosing a personal event she does not want to share. A role’s particular information requirement needs separate consideration; this article establishes no rules for every agreement. Privacy and responsibility can need negotiation. A simple

speech formula does not automatically resolve which amount of explanation every situation actually requires.

An apology need not abandon the original position’s content either. Vera can regret a sharp tone and still want another book. Or acknowledge an unsupported account of the organizer’s motive as excessive without changing reading preferences. The distinction repairs what actually needs repair. If acknowledging every error demands abandoning every personal desire, apology becomes general renunciation of participation. But rejecting every consequence through the right to speak directly makes responsibility disappear entirely from conversation.

The repair question is therefore definite: which sentence, fact, or action needs an answer? Check grounds, change wording, deliver promised material, or suggest a different arrangement. Total personal perfection and total wrongness are not the only alternatives. Someone can participate with an error while repairing its actual scope. This position guarantees neither forgiveness nor renewed trust. It simply adds no requirement to prove every future word’s general moral worth before someone returns to substantive conversation.

VI. Having a Voice Does Not Require Disclosure Everywhere

Vera does not want to speak extensively in some conversations. A new participant is not trusted, or the topic involves a personal circumstance unrelated to selecting a book. Silence’s appearance establishes no cause of that decision. Vera can retain a short answer, move the conversation, or disclose nothing about this experience now. Speaking for oneself includes choosing a recipient and amount. It creates no obligation to display openness to every person to count as sufficiently brave or authentic in shared life.

First-person speech can remain in gentle wording. Vera says she needs time, is not yet ready to discuss something, or wants to answer in writing. This contains a position without a loud declaration. A voice’s confidence is measured neither solely by force nor brevity. Chosen caution sometimes fits actual conditions. Which tone is available and which costs a particular statement incurs cannot be decided from afar. This article promises no transformation of every conversation into safety, equality, or pleasure simply by removing a preamble.

External authority matters too. Meetings have turn-taking rules; elsewhere someone speaks for an organization and must clarify personal positions. These conditions do not make experience insignificant. They determine a message’s arrangement and possible consequences. First-person speech replaces neither agreement, role, nor factual checking. See where authority needs clarification and where an unnecessary proof of the right to have any opinion is added. The distinction preserves situational limits without turning them into a characteristic of the whole speaker.

One remark can be prepared if that helps. Vera writes a book suggestion and chooses a recipient. Preparation means neither that spontaneous speech is unavailable nor that a text must already be perfect. It is a chosen action under particular conditions. She can reread, shorten, or retain length when length is actually needed. This practice demands no immediate speech. The right to an answer remains in the interval of choosing content or recipient, or not wanting to continue conversation now.

Sometimes declining speech remains inconvenient. Vera misses the chance to suggest a book and later regrets it. Acknowledge the result without a general verdict of cowardice. Another situation might provide different possibilities or the same limit. Silence’s cost need not be denied to defend a decision. Yet that cost makes disclosure no compulsory remedy for every difficulty. Our discussion concerns particular choice: which message someone wants to retain, where it might be heard, and which conditions they actually accept today.

VII. You Can Speak Without Knowing a Final Answer

Vera understands that the old book does not fit but has not found a replacement. Both facts can be reported without making absence of a complete solution prove inadmissibility of her reaction. The group might want an entire proposal; that is a shared-task condition needing clarification. Yet her relationship to reading already has content. It need not remain silent until a flawless plan appears. Someone can participate in forming the next decision as the author of a question, doubt, or partial answer, rather than only a finally proven position on every subject.

Doubt differs from apologizing for existence. “I am not sure yet” can accurately name the degree of knowledge. It does not automatically diminish permission to speak. Specify the uncertainty: a date, book choice, explanation of a reaction, or future participation. Uncertainty about one item need not extend to the entire voice. Vera can clearly want another format discussed without knowing which will suit others. That leaves space for their participation without declaring herself wrong in advance on every possible question.

Nor must inner permission be felt before sending a message. Vera can feel nervous while formulating a particular proposal. This is no anxiety intervention or promise that nervousness disappears. We simply make no chosen experience a compulsory condition of permissible speech. Content can be sufficiently clear alongside an uncomfortable feeling. Preferring to wait is another decision. No correct formula appoints someone to act immediately against their state or prove independence before an imagined witness of every personal choice.

Later conversation can clarify a position. Hearing the group’s explanation, Vera understands she wants more reading time rather than another novel. Her new report need not expose the old one as false; it communicates new clarity. An already expressed particular demand needs a named change so others can reorient themselves. Yet the whole right to participate need not

again be defended. A voice can change with information and experience while remaining responsible for what was actually said and which actions already resulted.

Incompletion therefore need not hide behind firm tone. Vera can say she is considering the question, wants options, or still retains the proposal. Each sentence has a subject. Directness need not require always knowing an answer or never revising it. An initial position becomes one possible part of conversation rather than a final judgment of self and others. This matters especially where meaning forms together: a personal report is needed but does not finish everyone’s whole forthcoming process of choosing a shared activity.

VIII. Speaking for Yourself Does Not Require Continually Defending Your Existence

Vera sent the proposal. A reply might arrive later, be short, or never appear. These events establish no general assessment of her voice. Ask whether it was seen if relevant, or wait for scheduled discussion. No immediate additional defence is required because silence supposedly already proved first-person speech inappropriate. Conversation has its time and conditions. Another’s pause retains its unknown cause even when Vera strongly wants to explain it through the group’s relationship to her personality.

A substantive response can be met substantively. A question about book length does not necessarily mean displeasure at Vera’s boldness; different taste need not reject recognition of her. Distinguish these explanations from actual content. Unpleasant treatment does sometimes occur and should not be denied for a positive story. Yet every relevant answer should not become a hidden general judgment either. Retain the question: which message arrived, what needs clarification, and which next actions are actually available in this conversation?

An unsuccessful tone can be repaired without rewriting personality. Vera noticed unnecessary sharpness, named it, and returned to book selection. A conversation that did not recover is a real limit of the result. First-person speech guarantees neither acceptance, closeness, nor absence of consequences. It retains a message’s author without appointing them omnipotent manager of others’ attitudes. Someone can know they spoke for themselves without knowing what follows. That limit proves neither the distinction’s uselessness nor a need to defend every future voice again in advance.

A pleasant answer should not become the only confirmation of speech’s legitimacy either. An accepted proposal can please Vera, but her taste existed before voting. The next answer might be negative. A voice need not receive fresh permission through every discussion’s outcome. Yet the shared decision remains participants’ actual decision rather than a formality around Vera. Value a personal report while considering someone else’s answer. Respect requires

neither dissolving one’s position nor making agreement a compulsory reward for sufficiently honest speech.

The next remark can be short, long, cautious, or unready. What matters is a definite author and subject, with necessary grounds addressing content. A fact’s source cannot be replaced by confident “I.” A request retains another’s answer; repair names an action. Yet generally defending the right to a reaction need not precede every sentence. Speak within the present scope, preserving others’ participation without promising infallibility, full understanding, or final agreement with everyone in advance.

What this means in practice

Take one message you actually want to convey. Clarify its subject: experience, preference, decision, request, or verifiable fact. For another person, separate observation from an account of their motive. The first person indicates an author but proves neither another’s intention nor general truth.

Examine the introduction: which sentence conveys conditions, and which asks for recognition of sufficient goodness before permission to speak? Keep useful context. Every courtesy or gentle word need not disappear. Try naming the main content so a listener knows what exactly needs an answer.

For a request, retain refusal and clarification; for a fact, necessary checking; for a broken promise, particular repair. No disclosure of every circumstance or production of a confident tone is required. Choose recipient, time, and amount through actual conversation. Uncertainty can be reported, or a text left unsent for now.

After a response, consider content while keeping unknown causes unknown. Change wording or a decision where needed without generally renouncing participation. This independent editorial practice is neither therapy nor a guarantee of acceptance. Stop at one remark if you choose: your report has a place in conversation, while a listener retains their answer and conditions of participation.

Key quotation

> *Trust thyself.*

Ralph Waldo Emerson, Self-Reliance, the essay’s opening. The Russian version identifies its own translation of this brief English appeal. A normative position guarantees no judgment’s truth; historical premises do not become compulsory conditions of the proposed editorial practice.

Connections between traditions

Basis	Independent editorial question	Boundary
Montaigne, address to the reader	What is my message's subject?	A literary preface is no ready-made formula for contemporary speech.
Emerson, Self-Reliance opening	Can I name a position while retaining its limit?	Normative self-trust is no empirical guarantee of correctness.
Imagined reading-group scene alongside both sources	How does useful context differ from justifying the right to participate?	An authorial example is neither research on behavioural causes nor a universal conversational contract.

The comparison of questions belongs to the authorial discussion; historical texts' differences are not reduced to one communication doctrine.

Primary sources

• S1. Michel de Montaigne. Essays — The Author to the Reader, Gutenberg3600, William Carew Hazlitt's 1877 edition. The title identifies Charles Cotton as the main body's translator, but an editorial note before this address states Cotton omitted it. The restored English preface's particular translator is therefore unassigned here: UNKNOWN. The complete address with notes, lines514–528, and title information were read; neither all Essays nor French original. The catalogue confirms public domain in the USA, rather than global clearance. The Russian fragment's own translation is identified.

• S2. Ralph Waldo Emerson. Essays, First Series — Self-Reliance, Gutenberg2944. The main text's opening, lines201–210, was read completely within that local scope, alongside title and catalogue; not the entire essay or collection. Automatic catalogue description is not primary grounding. Catalogue status is public domain USA; global rights were not separately established. The Russian fragment was independently translated.

Tags

first person, voice, statement, preamble, justification, preference, experience, decision, request, fact, motive, uncertainty, politeness, responsibility, repair, consent, refusal, privacy, recipient, time, content, participation, personal answer, reading group, Montaigne, Emerson, Essays, Self-Reliance, normative grounding, 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 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.