

UNITED WISDOM

Purpose: a useful direction or the expectation of a single answer?

Meaning and Direction

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

P05 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Purpose: a useful direction or the expectation of a single answer?

Epigraph

> *A man's heart deviseth his way: but the LORD directeth his steps.*

Proverbs16:9, King James Version, displayed KJV Standard edition.

What this article is about

Purpose promises to answer several questions at once: which activity to choose, why it matters and whether a life has direction. Sometimes the formulation connects interest with responsibility. Sometimes it makes a person wait for the single road without which everything already done supposedly fails to count. This article distinguishes a useful direction from the expectation of a biography settled in advance. It discusses the ends of activities, strong desires, received roles, conditions of participation and occasions when someone names another person’s purpose. Aristotle, Epictetus and Proverbs retain different philosophical and religious grounds; their texts provide no universal method for choosing an occupation. The contemporary scenes and questions are editorial proposals. They aim to clarify how the word is used while preserving the value of present life, actual commitments and a person’s right not to know a final answer.

I. What answer is hidden in the word purpose

A question about purpose often begins with a recognisable difficulty. A person can work, have relationships and meet obligations, yet these parts do not form a clear explanation of why they continue this particular arrangement of life. Purpose promises to bring the scattered parts together. First, however, it helps to notice that the word can contain different questions. One person asks which activity suits them; another asks whether their life has value; a third wonders whether there is a responsibility they have not yet recognised. An answer about an occupation need not answer the question of value, while a sense of significance does not identify a particular job. The conversation becomes more precise when the difference can be named without a demand to settle the whole of life immediately.

Imagine someone choosing between teaching and organisational work. They can discuss interest, abilities, conditions and the contribution of each option. If the conversation quietly becomes a search for the single assignment given to them at birth, the choice acquires another burden: an error seems to invalidate their life. They are no longer simply comparing two

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

activities. It is therefore useful to clarify what an answer is expected to provide. Is it a present direction, an explanation of significant participation, or a final guarantee that no other path could have been right? The strength of a desire, success or other people's approval cannot by themselves supply that guarantee. Its absence still leaves room for a considered choice, even though it does not remove all uncertainty.

The wish for coherence does not make a person naive. It can matter to see how today's effort connects with something valued beyond the present day. Coherence, however, can take different forms: a lasting commitment, several related activities, care for people or participation in a shared undertaking. Not every form receives a grand name. If purpose helps explain such a connection and attend to its consequences, the word can be useful. If it requires proof of an exceptional role before any participation becomes worthwhile, its meaning narrows. The following discussion distinguishes these uses while keeping philosophical, Stoic and biblical grounds separate. None becomes a test that assigns the reader their one true occupation.

II. The end of an activity and a biography written in advance

In the first book of the Nicomachean Ethics, Aristotle considers the ends of different activities and the good of human life. His account of human activity belongs to a philosophical discussion of good action and virtue. It is not a method for identifying an individual occupation from personal traits. The example of a musician concerns the quality of performance; it does not establish that each person has been assigned one instrument or social position. A contemporary reader can take a distinction from it: what an activity is for and how it is carried out. Their own question about purpose still arises in different circumstances. Referring to an ancient author does not turn a present career hypothesis into a conclusion that the author has already proved.

Consider a hypothetical editor who values helping people understand difficult questions more clearly. This explains an end of the work. It does not yet establish the one setting in which that end can be pursued: a journal, library, teaching or conversations with colleagues offer different forms of participation. Nor does it remove the question of quality. A text can be inspired by a worthy intention and still contain inaccuracies; an elegant description of a calling does not correct them. A direction becomes more substantive when a person can identify the result, their way of working and responsibility for mistakes. The dignified name given to an activity retains value alongside attention to what another person actually receives.

This approach changes the scale of the expectation. Instead of asking which biography must come true, a person can ask what they presently value and how their participation expresses it. The question remains serious: an answer may involve prolonged learning, difficult work or reconsidering relationships. Yet it allows conditions to be clarified and more than one possible

form. A significant direction can survive a change of tool, while an earlier form may cease to serve it. This article does not examine changes of calling in detail. Here it is enough to recognise that an end and the name of a role are not identical. Joining them in advance makes every change of job title look like a loss of grounding, even when the person continues to value and perform recognisably related work.

III. A strong desire still needs a description

Purpose is sometimes recognised by the strength of a desire: if an activity is so compelling, it must be the answer. Desire does reveal something about interest, but its object benefits from description. A person may want the work itself, its result, recognition, independence or the image of someone who does it. These aspects can coexist; distinguishing them does not require suspicion that every interest is insincere. It helps avoid treating an attractive picture as complete knowledge of an activity. Someone may love the idea of addressing an audience while not yet knowing how they relate to preparation, checking material and recurring classes. That is a gap in experience in a particular area, rather than exposure of a false personality or a final prohibition on making the choice.

Suppose a person wants to create a place where people can meet. That wish may include love of conversation, interest in arranging an environment and an expectation of respect. Before calling the whole wish a purpose, the different parts of participation can be described. Who maintains the schedule and agreements, responds to complaints and performs unexciting recurring work? Which parts attract the person, which are acceptable, and which remain unfamiliar? The description is not a test intended to extinguish the aspiration. It distinguishes a desired result from the activities that sustain it. More can be learned through an accessible conversation or a limited encounter with the work where appropriate. Such experience supplies information; it cannot guarantee discovery of the single assignment for a lifetime.

The reverse error is to require a powerful feeling at all times before participation counts as authentic. Work can matter even when today consists of fatigue, repetition or an unsuccessful attempt. Its importance still does not justify every condition. A difficult day, an unacceptable workload and a loss of interest call for different questions rather than one moral judgement. A useful direction helps distinguish what remains valuable, what obstructs participation and which limits need discussion. A person need not continually prove their purpose through their emotional state. Equally, a formula once found need not close discussion of the actual work. A living description includes both interest and circumstances while leaving room for information that is still missing.

IV. A received role and one’s own agreement

In section seventeen of the Enchiridion, Epictetus uses the image of an actor given a character to perform. The image belongs to Stoic reflection on circumstances and action. It does not coincide with the modern idea of a freely chosen professional calling. Both sides of the distinction deserve attention: some conditions of life are indeed received without choice, yet this does not make every demand from other people a legitimate role. Assigned may refer to circumstances of birth, a belief about the order of the world, a family expectation or a specific agreement. Those grounds cannot replace one another. The distinction matters especially when someone calls their own decision another person’s destiny and thereby closes the possibility of discussion.

Imagine an adult told since childhood that they must continue a family undertaking. There is a history, invested effort and perhaps actual agreements. These deserve precise consideration. Yet the phrase this is your purpose does not specify what was promised, by whom, when or on what terms. It can merge love for relatives with unconditional acceptance of particular work. The conversation becomes clearer when expectations and obligations are named separately. One participant wants the undertaking preserved; another is willing to help differently; a third needs recognition of earlier effort. The disagreement may remain difficult. It nevertheless supplies something to discuss, whereas an argument over who knows another person’s destiny better often leaves only mutual accusations.

Agreement does not mean complete power over circumstances. The possibility of refusing can be limited by resources, position, dependencies and obligations to others. Recognising those limits describes reality more accurately; it does not declare the person insufficiently brave. Their agreement can also take different forms: I choose this direction; I participate temporarily from necessity; I am keeping a specific promise; I do not yet see an acceptable alternative. These statements differ, yet each permits an explanation without an exalted story about destiny. Where there is threat or coercion, a philosophical image of a role cannot replace appropriate help. Participation can be discussed in proportion to the situation without demanding an immediate heroic decision or attributing agreement merely because the person still remains.

V. Contribution that does not require exceptional status

Purpose is sometimes linked to an activity that nobody else could perform. Ordinary participation then begins to seem replaceable and therefore insignificant. Yet a replaceable contributor does not make the result worthless. Someone who carefully explains how to approach an institution may be replaced by another employee; the clear explanation received by a visitor does not thereby become empty. Discussing contribution means attending to actual relationships rather than only to the contributor’s exceptional status. What happened for another person, and on what grounds do we call it good? That question allows a modest answer without a promise to change the world. Attention to the answer keeps the meaning of an activity close to its everyday performance.

There is a useful distinction between valuing participation and claiming an entitlement to be indispensable. In a hypothetical shared undertaking, someone connects participants and notices overlooked questions. They may reasonably value that contribution. If it becomes a demand that everything must always pass through them, however, the original benefit changes shape. Other people acquire a dependency, while the contributor acquires the burden of continually proving a special position. Their description of purpose can be considered alongside its consequences. Does it help others act more clearly, or make their agreement part of the proof of someone’s exceptional status? The question needs no diagnosis of hidden motives. It can be examined through actual rules, expectations and what participants can discuss without being punished.

A significant undertaking can belong to many people at once. Its continuation after one contributor leaves does not invalidate earlier work. Sometimes a good result is expressed in another person’s ability to use what was created without the author’s constant presence. This is not a universal rule for every activity: personal contact or rare skill can be decisive in some tasks. Even there, value need not reduce to a claim that everything is meaningless without me. A useful language of purpose can describe a contribution, recognise others’ participation and preserve their independence. A person is then connected to the work through responsibility and quality, rather than through other people’s obligation to confirm an exceptional biography whenever a new decision arises.

VI. Waiting for an answer and participating today

A search for purpose can provide time for serious reflection. Sometimes, though, an answer becomes permission to live: until it is found, every activity is considered preliminary and almost unreal. Today's care, work or learning is valued only as a pause before the main event. Its own significance becomes difficult to see, even when it already affects other people. What is the sought word supposed to permit: choosing a direction, explaining dissatisfaction or escaping uncertainty? These are different tasks. A person can continue seeking one answer while recognising present participation. Incomplete understanding of an entire life does not invalidate each current action or remove the possibility of acting carefully.

Consider someone helping prepare a family move who calls it a lost month because they have not found a great calling. The feeling may have real grounds: the move consumes time, a personal wish is postponed and the division of labour seems unfair. Those circumstances deserve discussion. A specific contribution can also be recognised: who gained clarity, which difficulty was resolved and what remained for others. Recognising it does not require calling the move a destiny or accepting that division forever. It holds the significance of what was done alongside questions about the conditions. The month need be neither heroic proof of a mission nor entirely erased time.

Waiting may be necessary, especially where substantial commitments or missing information are involved. Yet waiting can be described specifically. What am I waiting for, what remains unknown, what am I doing meanwhile and who depends on the pause? Such questions do not turn life into a productivity table. They give present time a form that can be discussed. A search can continue without a daily demand for a final statement of purpose. Meanwhile, the person participates in existing relationships, and their agreement, fatigue and possibilities matter now. A later answer may clarify direction; it need not retrospectively give all earlier time permission to count as lived.

VII. Conditions of participation and a person's value

When an assumed purpose is linked to a particular activity, obstacles can become a personal verdict. Lack of time, access to learning, health or support supposedly means insufficient desire. That conclusion overlooks conditions that wanting alone cannot create. An obstacle can instead be named at its actual scale: I cannot participate in this way, now, under these circumstances. That differs from declaring oneself meaningless. It also does not promise that every barrier can be overcome. A precise description helps identify available possibilities, actual limits and questions needing other people's help. A person's value remains separate from their ability to carry out a desired scenario.

A person who wants to do research may temporarily perform quite different work. There can be tension between these activities, but temporary need not mean empty. Current work sustains important conditions, contributes something or supports relationships. Its arrangement may need change; it may leave no room for research. These are specific questions, rather than proof of self-betrayal. They can be examined without a ready financial strategy or a promise of successful transition. Desired form, available participation and the cost of a change for those affected remain distinct. The result may be a clearer account of a barrier or recognition that an acceptable next step has not yet been found.

A discussion of purpose also needs room for an ordinary life. Every interest need not become a great public task, nor every ability a permanent service to others. A person may value closeness, quiet work, participation in a small circle and activities for which they make no grand promise. This proves neither an absence of direction nor satisfaction with every circumstance. It expresses another scale of explanation. A word that describes that scale respectfully can help. A word that recognises only exceptional biographies excludes many human ways of living in advance. Their value then has to be justified against a standard whose grounds were never discussed with those it evaluates.

VIII. Providence and the promise of a single road

Proverbs places human intention alongside the Lord’s action. The ninth verse of chapter sixteen, used as the epigraph, retains that religious relationship. It names no occupation and provides no method for recognising one through coincidences. For a believing reader, a path may belong to trust in God; for someone who does not share that faith, it remains testimony to another understanding of the world. Neither position requires translating God into a psychological capacity or presenting religious language as common proof. A shared life question permits conversation while preserving different grounds for an answer. It does not make every contemporary recommendation a biblical promise.

The hope for a sign can be attractive: once the road is assigned, responsibility supposedly becomes easier because it only needs recognition. Yet a claim about a sign requires grounds and belongs to a practice of interpretation. A strong experience, chance encounter or successful beginning does not by itself prove that every later decision is determined. Within religious life, a person may discuss an experience in their tradition; this article sets no rules for spiritual discernment. In a shared conversation, it helps to say what was experienced and which conclusion is proposed. Another person can then understand its significance without having to accept the conclusion as obvious or accept a decision it assigns them.

Trust can coexist with learning, acknowledging mistakes and discussing consequences. Different traditions ground that relationship differently; they are not reduced here to one doctrine. The contemporary editorial point is narrower: purpose does not remove the need to

explain a specific promise, especially where others are affected. Someone may understand an undertaking as a religious calling, while those around them still ask about agreements and the limits of their own participation. Respect for a conviction does not require unconditional agreement to another person’s use of their time or effort. Such a conversation preserves the significance of faith for its holder and the independence of someone who need not share it or participate in the chosen form.

IX. When someone names another person’s purpose

Sometimes a significant other person first speaks of purpose: a teacher, relative, friend or manager. Their observation may be valuable. They can notice an underestimated ability or suggest an unfamiliar kind of work. Yet a suggestion differs from a final definition of someone else’s life. A suggestion can be explained through observations and discussed; a definition often requires trust in special knowledge of the other person. Concrete grounds help: which actions were noticed, what was good about them and what conditions are assumed? Asking does not reject support. It makes the support understandable and lets the person consider it alongside their experience, interest and limits.

Imagine a manager saying an employee’s purpose is always to help people, so additional requests should not tire them. Warm recognition quietly becomes a rule granting access to someone’s effort. The two statements can be separated: I value your attentiveness; we need to discuss the amount of this work. Fatigue does not disprove an ability to help, and ability does not constitute agreement to every workload. Limits may still need discussion where mutual respect is strong. Support remains open when a person can clarify the proposal, decline it or state conditions. Calling refusal a betrayal of purpose makes a disagreement about work into a judgement of the whole person.

Receiving advice need not mean accepting or rejecting it completely. A person can keep an observation about an ability while declining the proposed biography. They can ask for an example, discuss their experience with someone else or leave the question open. This matters especially where they depend strongly on the adviser. Support does not become weaker when its grounds can be named. The adviser’s confidence need not determine the recipient’s confidence either. In its useful sense, purpose remains language through which a person can explain participation. It is not a seal placed on their life by someone else, which can no longer be examined or questioned.

X. A direction that can be explained

A working description of purpose can begin without forever: I presently value this participation, see these grounds for it and am willing to discuss these commitments. The statement includes a direction, confidence with limits and a connection to action. It does not prove that any other life would be impossible or wrong. Yet it can be related to experience, questioned and clarified. A person need not abandon a stronger religious or philosophical understanding. They can distinguish their conviction from the grounds they offer someone else for working together. Conversation becomes possible when significance does not replace explanation and explanation does not require everyone to share a worldview.

A direction can be considered through the questions it helps reveal. Does it clarify what is cared for, distinguish a result from the image of a role, and leave room for another person’s agreement? Can it notice the cost of participation, inaccuracies or changing conditions? These are editorial questions, not a validated scale of purpose. They support discussion of a particular formulation. An answer may be useful in private reflection yet insufficient for a shared promise. A personal sense of connection to an undertaking, for example, does not explain an expected result to a client. As more people are affected, understandable conditions become more important regardless of their attitude to someone else’s life story.

Purpose remains an open human question when different answers and limits of knowledge are permitted. A useful direction can connect interest, value and responsibility without promising a final decoding of life. Expecting a single answer becomes burdensome when every ordinary choice must prove conformity to an invisible biography. The uses can already be distinguished in today’s conversation: what does the word mean, which participation does it explain and what does it demand of others? The answer may be modest. It still matters if it makes further action more understandable and gives uncertainty its actual place. A person need not become completely known to themselves before participating more carefully in a life already underway.

What this means in practice

Take a recent statement of your own about purpose and rewrite it as a specific question. This is an editorial exercise, not a diagnostic test or a programme with established efficacy. Are you asking about a suitable activity, the significance of present participation, the grounds of an obligation or a wish for final certainty? Several questions may emerge; they need not all be answered now. Choose one that actually needs clarification.

Describe what is already known. Name an interest, an actual action, experience gained and conditions that must be considered. Record expectations separately: what do you hope an answer will provide, and what remains unknown? Missing information need not become a

conclusion about your value. If a proposed form is unavailable, that particular limit can be named without declaring the whole life wrongly chosen.

Consider who would be affected. Is there an actual promise, another person’s need or only your idea of what ought to help? Where appropriate, discuss one specific question with a participant while preserving their possibility of giving their own answer. Support can be received as an observation without giving the adviser final authority over your biography. In conditions of strong dependency or coercion, this exercise cannot replace appropriate help.

Finish with a provisional direction: this participation presently matters to me for these reasons; these conditions need inquiry or agreement; this question remains open. A further action might be a conversation, learning about the work, a limited encounter with an activity or a considered pause. None proves a destiny. A useful result would be clearer understanding of your question and the responsibility you are willing to discuss now.

Key quotation

> *Happiness, then, is something final and self-sufficient, and is the end of action.*

Aristotle. Nicomachean Ethics, I.7, W. D. Ross translation. Happiness here belongs to a philosophical account of human good, rather than discovery of an occupation.

Connections between traditions

The comparison concerns the named passages, rather than entire traditions. A limited resemblance establishes no single teaching about purpose.

Question	Specific sides of the comparison	Limited resemblance	Difference and boundary of application
What activity aims towards	Aristotle I.1–2: the ends of activities and the highest good; Proverbs16:1–3: intentions, the weighing of spirits and committing works to the Lord.	Both consider a particular intention in relation to a broader ground of evaluation.	Aristotle offers philosophical reasoning about good and politics; Proverbs concerns a person's relationship with the Lord. Neither passage identifies the reader's one true occupation.

Question	Specific sides of the comparison	Limited resemblance	Difference and boundary of application
A general function and a received role	Aristotle I.7: human activity according to reason; Epictetus17: an actor and an allotted role.	Both permit a question about the quality of activity rather than only an occupation's name.	Aristotle's human function is a general philosophical argument; Epictetus's role belongs to a Stoic image of an allotted life. The grounds differ, and a role metaphor grants another person no authority to assign the reader a life path.
A plan and the limits of command	Epictetus1: what depends on us and what does not; Proverbs16:9: a person plans a way while the Lord directs the steps.	Both resist simply identifying a personal intention with the entirety of what happens.	The Stoic distinction between judgement and external circumstances differs from biblical trust in the Lord. Resemblance makes these no single force and promises no prediction of a career choice's result.
Conditions of life and evaluating income	Aristotle I.8, the external-goods paragraph: their part in the possibility of acting; Proverbs16:8: a little with righteousness and great revenues without right.	The amount received does not by itself exhaust a question about good living or good action.	Aristotle considers external conditions within his historical system, including evaluations of ancestry and appearance that this essay does not adopt as contemporary norms; Proverbs offers religious and moral evaluation. Neither poverty nor wealth is a test of purpose here.

Question	Specific sides of the comparison	Limited resemblance	Difference and boundary of application
Life among others	Aristotle I.7: self-sufficiency also concerns family and fellow citizens; Proverbs16:6–7: mercy, truth, fear of the Lord and relations with enemies.	Both place a person's life beyond an isolated achievement or exceptional status.	Aristotle's polis and philosophical good are not identical with the biblical relationship to the Lord. The religious statement about peace with enemies becomes no guarantee for a present-day conversation; contemporary agreements and another person's boundaries need their own discussion.

Primary sources

1. Aristotle. Nicomachean Ethics, I.1–3, I.7 and the external-goods paragraph of I.8, W. D. Ross translation. Ends and the quality of activity; key quotation.

2. Epictetus. Enchiridion17, Elizabeth Carter translation. A received role in its Stoic setting.

3. Proverbs16:1–9, King James Version. Epigraph16:9; Russian quotation translated from the displayed KJV.

Only the passages identified in the research notes were read. Russian quotations are United Wisdom translations from the named English translations, not direct translations from the original languages. All contemporary scenes are hypothetical editorial examples.

Tags

purpose, calling, direction, meaning, choice, value, end, activity, participation, interest, desire, biography, occupation, conditions, responsibility, agreement, role, commitments, support, uncertainty, faith, providence, Aristotle, Epictetus, Proverbs, virtue, quality, autonomy, everyday life, orientation

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.