

UNITED WISDOM

Beauty as a Source of Meaning

Meaning and Direction

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

P09 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Beauty as a Source of Meaning

Epigraph

> *...a nature of wondrous beauty...*

Plato, Symposium, concluding Diotima sequence, paragraph beginning “He who has been instructed thus far”; Benjamin Jowett translation. Short fragment; ellipses mark continuation.

What this article is about

Something beautiful can interrupt an ordinary day: light on a wall, the sound of a sentence, or the arrangement of a familiar object catches someone’s attention. The encounter can become significant without answering the question of life’s entire meaning. This article examines a more particular connection: how attending to beauty can prompt a distinction about what matters, and how to preserve the limits of that experience. It draws on Diotima’s concluding speech in Plato’s Symposium, the opening sections of Kant’s Critique of Judgement, and selected passages from John Ruskin’s Modern Painters, volume II. Metaphysical ascent, a distinction within aesthetic judgment, and a Christian account of sympathy remain different grounds. Contemporary scenes are invented illustrations, not reported studies. Beauty here certifies no moral superiority, proves no higher reality and promises no healing. It can help pose a question about the significance of a particular relationship without requiring everyone to feel alike or discover beauty in a painful event.

I. Significance begins with something particular

Imagine someone passing a small bowl on a shelf every day. One morning they notice an irregularity in the glaze and the line of its rim. The object has supplied no new biographical truth, but has ceased to be mere background. Perhaps the person remembers choosing it, or considers an unknown maker’s work for the first time. The event can be described precisely: I noticed something previously overlooked. Any subsequent significance belongs to this particular relationship, not to a demonstrated power of every beautiful object to transform a life. The scale should not expand too quickly. A small act of attention can remain small and still deserve a place in an account of the day.

“Meaning” also needs a scale. It can refer to a sentence’s content, an action’s purpose, a reason for choosing, or the felt importance of an encounter. These are different matters. Someone who values music does not necessarily obtain instructions for their next decision from it. They may say that attentive listening itself matters in this particular sequence of sounds. That statement describes a relationship rather than establishing art’s universal

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

purpose. Instead of asking what meaning beauty supplied, it can be more precise to ask what became noticeable, which connection seemed worth preserving, or which distinction between indifference and importance became expressible. An unfinished answer need not be false or inadequate.

This starting point leaves room for someone who feels no such response now. Lack of response establishes neither an impoverished inner life nor defective taste or inability to understand important things. The object may simply be uninteresting to them; their circumstances and concerns may differ. In our imagined scene, another person sees the bowl and continues with their task. The first acquires no right to judge that person's depth by this gesture. Discussion stays open when it describes one's attention rather than turning that attention into an examination for others. Looking together can begin with an invitation, but an invitation remains meaningful only if declining requires no defence against someone else's aesthetic expectation.

II. Taste does not replace knowledge

In § 1 of the Critique of Judgement, Kant distinguishes aesthetic judgment from cognition of an object. In J. H. Bernard's English translation, representation is referred to the subject's feeling when taste is at issue. This philosophical distinction helps avoid giving an impression excessive evidential force. We can admire a building without knowing its history, structural reliability or construction conditions. Beauty of form does not answer those separate questions, which require information and methods appropriate to them. "I find this beautiful" does not mean "I have established all the object's important properties." Attention to beauty can precede inquiry, but cannot complete it through the mere strength or quietness of an aesthetic response.

Imagine a visitor studying a photograph of an old courtyard. The connection between light, empty space and an open window seems significant. That describes an encounter with an image. It does not establish that life in the courtyard was happy or that the photographer accurately conveyed relationships among its residents. The visitor might want to learn the circumstances of the photograph and hear other accounts. Aesthetic attention then begins a question rather than granting permission to bypass witnesses. An image can be expressive and incomplete at once. Acknowledging incompleteness does not devalue the encounter: it separates what someone actually saw from a story provisionally imagined around the sight.

The distinction also applies to larger conclusions. A landscape's harmony is not, by itself, evidence that all human events form a harmonious order. A beautiful face does not establish reliability in keeping promises. An elegant argument still needs its grounds examined. In each case, the observed form's merit can be a real subject of discussion, while the next assertion requires another basis. Naming the transition helps: I am now speaking about a person's

character, the world’s order, or an explanation’s truth, rather than beauty alone. Precision preserves aesthetic experience’s own content without making it responsible for information an encounter with a beautiful object has neither supplied nor undertaken to supply.

III. Plato’s widening of the question

In Diotima’s concluding sequence in the Symposium, attention moves from a particular beautiful body to other bodies, souls, institutions and knowledge. Benjamin Jowett’s translation presents this movement as culminating in contemplation of beauty itself. It is a particular philosophical construction, reported and endorsed by Socrates, rather than an obligatory itinerary for every reader. Its narrower relevance here is that an encounter can prompt questions about why this object matters and where else something important is found. Such editorial use of the question neither proves Plato’s metaphysics nor turns an ancient hierarchy of bodily and spiritual matters into a contemporary scale for grading the worth of living people.

Widening attention should be distinguished from devaluing the first object. In an imagined scene, someone first admires a musical phrase’s performance, then becomes interested in how ensemble members listen to one another. The first object remains worthwhile; another question has appeared. That possibility is our analogical reasoning, not a claim about a psychological effect of listening. Plato’s speech arranges movement differently and gives it a particular summit. Taking a narrower question about attention from it requires stating that selection. One observation cannot be promised to deliver the outcome of an entire philosophical ascent, and remaining interested in a particular thing cannot be treated as moral or spiritual failure.

Plato’s transition includes a claim that enduring beauty exists beyond particular beautiful things. Kant’s distinction in the preceding section supplies no identical conclusion; it identifies a kind of judgment. Their grounds must remain separate even when both texts help discuss beauty. A contemporary reader can accept one argument, dispute the other, or leave the issue open. Particular attention does not require first settling every philosophical disagreement. Someone can say that an encounter prompted thought about what they value. The statement is narrower than an assertion about ultimate being, but makes the person’s present thought and its limits easier to name. Philosophical uncertainty need not erase a concrete occasion of significance.

IV. Pleasure and importance are different words

In §§ 3–5, Kant distinguishes the pleasant, the beautiful and the good. Inclination matters for the pleasant; the good involves a concept and approval grounded in reason; judgment of beauty has a different status. The scheme need not become a questionnaire for classifying every feeling. It helps show that pleasure alone does not explain why an encounter became important. Someone may like a bowl's colour while its significance also concerns the giver or time deliberately spent looking. Those relationships can be named separately. An aesthetic quality then need not carry, by itself, all the object's remembered connections, moral evaluation and practical role in someone's present life.

Bernard renders Kant's characterisation of satisfaction in beauty as disinterested and free. In § 2, the issue is the difference between interest in an object's existence and judgment of its representation, not an instruction to become indifferent to people. We can look carefully at a building without wanting to own it and still ask moral questions about its construction. Kant himself distinguishes discussion of a palace and its circumstances from the pure question of taste. That separates questions rather than abolishing circumstances. Significance in our essay can concern their connection, but the transition must remain visible when aesthetic attention continues as memory, responsibility or investigation of particular conditions.

Kant also mentions flowers whose beauty requires no determinate concept of what they ought to mean. Our title should therefore not promise to decode a compulsory message within every beautiful thing. A "source of meaning" here names a possibility of lived significance, not a hidden dictionary assigning the correct life answer to each form. A flower can supply no decision and still merit attention. One person remembers a garden, another considers a petal's line, and a third walks past. These different relationships need no single translation. Importance emerges in an account of a particular encounter, while the object remains available to other attention and under no obligation to confirm our story.

V. Ruskin: beauty and sympathy

In selected § 17 of chapter III, Modern Painters, volume II, part III, section I, Ruskin distinguishes typical from vital beauty. He connects the first with Divine attributes expressed in material forms, and the second with felicitous fulfilment of a living function. This is a historical theory with explicit theological grounds, not a measured law of perception. It shows how different answers can stand behind the word "beauty." Ruskin does more than report liking a form: he places it within an order of value. A reader can examine that answer's construction without accepting it entire or applying historical descriptions of health as judgments about a particular person's worth.

In §§ 1–2 of chapter XII, Ruskin compares snow with Alpine flowers and links attention to living things with sympathy and Christian charity. The flower's image matters within his argument, but constitutes neither botanical research nor evidence for an emotional effect of walking. The same response cannot be promised to a reader meeting the same plant. A narrower question is available: when does form cease to be only a pattern and prompt thought about a nearby living thing? An imagined contemporary example might concern care for a shared garden. That application belongs to our editorial reasoning, while Ruskin's assertion about approaching God remains his specifically Christian ground.

The limit matters particularly where a historical text connects right feeling with a rightly disposed heart. This essay grades nobody's worth by aesthetic response, faith, health or appearance. A reader can reject Ruskin's theology, feel no sympathy on seeing a flower, and retain a full moral life. Comparing sources must not become an examination of membership in the correct group of feeling people. Naming the argument's condition is enough: within a Christian understanding of charity, Ruskin develops one connection between beauty and care. Outside that ground, the connection needs its own justification. An expressive or personally resonant literary description does not make it universal merely by seeming persuasive.

VI. What an encounter allows us to describe

Something beautiful can enter a life's account through the encounter's circumstances. Someone remembers not only a painting, but a conversation afterwards, a place where stopping became possible, or a question arising on the way home. Those connections need not be called properties of the painting itself. Imagine two acquaintances viewing one image: its shoreline matters to one, while the other remembers someone who loved that place. They can describe different matters without disputing ownership of the only correct depth. The encounter includes form and relationships each can name. Acknowledging that composition avoids requiring the artwork to verify every event and significance a particular viewer connects with it in memory.

A beautiful memory does not establish that an entire former period was good. A difficult time might contain an important encounter without becoming less difficult; a calm period might leave no remembered beauty. This essay asks no one to rewrite a biography around a compulsory bright episode. Two separate statements can stand: that time was hard; this detail nevertheless stayed with me. If the second statement is unavailable now, the first requires no aesthetic supplement. If it is available, it need not justify everything else. An accurate account preserves each assertion's scale instead of producing a harmonious plot in which beauty must repair conflict or retrospectively explain losses.

Here the discussion differs from a search for a secret message. A memory can help someone recognise the importance of attentive presence, a certain conversational rhythm, or seeing

what others have made. Yet the conclusion remains a present interpretation, revisable when information or interest changes. Even a cherished encounter need not establish a lifelong definition of identity. Yesterday its significance concerned solitude; today it concerns looking together. Those accounts need not refute one another. Beauty as an occasion for thought remains open when its current role can be named without undertaking always to feel the same, or requiring a memory never to change its shade of significance.

VII. Beauty issues no moral certificate

In § 5, Kant explicitly distinguishes attractive manners from moral grounds: a pleasing form of conduct can exist without virtue. That boundary matters when beauty is connected with meaning. If someone speaks beautifully about care, their promises and actions still require separate attention. An organisation’s expressive setting does not settle the conditions of its conduct. Aesthetic merit need not disappear after this distinction, but ceases to provide sufficient grounds for trust. A well-arranged form can be acknowledged while information about commitments is requested. The purpose is not to destroy an impression through suspicion, but to distinguish two matters, each deserving assessment on its own grounds in the particular situation.

Ruskin’s connection between beauty and Christian charity works differently. It develops moral content within a particular theological understanding, whereas Kant’s distinction blocks a direct inference from pleasing form to good will. Comparison reveals different grounds rather than assembling a universal formula from two texts. Our editorial question about care begins with an actual matter: who owns a space, whose participation requires consent, and which conditions should be preserved? Attractive presentation cannot supply those answers. Beauty can draw attention to them, while moral assessment requires hearing participants and considering actions. A source of interest and a reason for deciding can be connected without becoming the same evidence.

Beauty in a person demands the same caution. Appearance establishes neither honesty, depth, care nor entitlement to advantage. Historical hierarchies of bodily and spiritual matters provide no permission to grade human worth by proportions, age, illness or conformity to a model. Imagine an artwork discussion in which one participant speaks little and uses no expressive language. Their relationship to the work is not thereby less significant than an eloquent account. Shared conversation needs room for different ways of participating. Beauty can be one subject of exchange, but cannot become a condition people must meet before being heard, retaining boundaries, or being counted as equal participants in moral life.

VIII. Offer a view without assigning a feeling

An important encounter can invite sharing: showing a place, playing a recording, or suggesting a closer look at a work. An invitation differs from a demand for admiration. Imagine someone bringing a friend to a window where light falls on a wall. The friend notices something else, or nothing special. The first can describe what they saw instead of asking why the second failed to feel correctly. Sharing need not consist of identical answers; it can involve attending to a difference. Needing to leave, postpone discussion or decline a recording does not make the invited person responsible for destroying the significance the encounter holds for the one who offered it.

Kant’s question about taste is not reducible to treating all preferences as identical; later sections discuss a judgment’s claim to generality. This essay adopts §§ 1–5, however, without deriving a ready procedure for settling disputes. Our contemporary scene needs a narrower editorial boundary: another person’s feeling cannot be assigned by command. Grounds for attention can be offered—a line, a rhythm, a relation of parts—and objections heard. Discussion then becomes more particular than exchanging “beautiful” and “ugly.” Disagreement can introduce another object of attention without having to produce agreement, shared taste or better relations for the exchange to remain capable of a respectful ending.

Being able to end the conversation also protects one’s own experience. Universal approval is unnecessary for recognising an encounter as personally important. That right does not oblige others to participate in its account. A memory can be kept, an object investigated further, or the topic changed. If beauty becomes a condition of group belonging, its significance starts depending on the approved response. Returning to the object can help: what exactly did we want to look at together? Discussion of form can continue without competition over the depth of feeling. If continuation is unnecessary now, the encounter can remain part of the day without a collective verdict about its place in an entire life.

IX. What is visible and how it became available

An encounter with beauty occurs under conditions not always visible at first. Someone made an object, preserved a work, permitted access, maintained a place or set aside time. This does not prove beauty’s usefulness or require every action to justify itself aesthetically. It notices that a particular opportunity to look has relationships of its own. Imagine a visitor admiring a small garden beside a house without knowing who maintains it or whether entry is permitted. Wanting a closer view does not abolish boundaries. The encounter’s significance can be retained together with respect for its conditions, rather than treating an aesthetic impression as permission to command someone else’s work or space.

Precision does not make the encounter less free. Freedom of aesthetic attention differs from freedom to use any object however one wishes. Form can be contemplated while authorship, an agreement or access limits are acknowledged. Naming a work's source can be appropriate in public discussion; asking about presence can be appropriate in someone else's space. These are contemporary editorial considerations, not procedures directly supplied by Plato's speech or Ruskin's flower. A historical author should not be credited with a ready answer to today's arrangements. Grounds for attention can be compared, and obligations within a particular situation then formulated independently, preserving the difference between a source of thought and a present decision.

People do not have equal access to places, time, works or modes of perception. A gallery or garden example therefore cannot measure a life's fullness. Significance can concern other things, or no aesthetic object need be chosen at present. This essay prescribes no compulsory cultural leisure and associates its absence with no personal failure. The question remains particular: if an encounter has happened and matters, which of its conditions deserve notice? A short answer may name an author, acknowledge time offered, or preserve distance. No large new undertaking, purchase, household change or demonstration of living more beautifully than others is required to give that answer its appropriate scope.

X. Meaning without a compulsory final answer

After an encounter, someone might ask what they have understood about life. The question is possible, not compulsory, and needs no immediate comprehensive answer. A narrower beginning is available: I want to listen more closely to a particular person; seeing a maker's work matters; I noticed something previously taken as mere familiarity. Each statement has its own scale and remains open to examination in subsequent experience. Beauty becomes an occasion for distinguishing rather than a guarantee that every future conclusion is true. If no conclusion appears, the encounter is not a failed lesson. It can remain a memory, a question or a few attentive minutes without an obligation to complete a worldview.

The three authors preserve distinctions through different routes. Plato's speech widens the question and proposes a metaphysical culmination; Kant separates aesthetic judgment, interest and moral approval; Ruskin places attention to living things within Christian charity. These differences should not disappear into an attractive common formula. A contemporary reader can recognise related questions without treating their answers as identical. Sources can then be approached without prior agreement with an entire tradition. An important encounter can prompt further reading, more precise disagreement or an account of one's own grounds. Continuing to read remains a choice, however, rather than a compulsory payment for being allowed to consider the encounter significant.

Preserving an encounter’s significance sometimes means letting it be limited. The light changes, a conversation ends, and the object becomes part of the room again. Nobody must hold the same feeling continually or convert it into a programme for life. Something familiar ceased to be indifferent for a while; other important tasks can remain beside it. If the relationship changes, the earlier encounter need not have been deceptive: it belonged to its time and a particular form of attention. Beauty as a source of meaning here is a possibility of noticing and naming significance while retaining freedom over the next response. Possibility guarantees no outcome and requires no identical response from everyone meeting the same object.

What this means in practice

If further reflection is welcome, an already familiar and accessible object that seems beautiful can be chosen. No special feeling needs to be sought or reproduced. Name separately what you noticed in its form, what the encounter means now, and what information about the object you actually possess. Unknown matters can remain unknown rather than being filled with an attractive assumption.

If significance involves another person, place or someone’s work, consider one appropriate form of attention: asking about a work, naming its maker, hearing another evaluation, or respecting a space’s boundary. These are possible actions, not compulsory gratitude practice. Beautiful presentation cannot replace checking promises, participation conditions and consent.

Reflection can end with a brief account: this detail mattered to me today. There is no requirement to prove life’s comprehensive meaning, feel relief or assign a new project. The question can be postponed if it does not suit the moment. These examples are neither treatment nor a test of the ability to see beauty; lack of response supplies no final judgment about human worth or the fullness of a life.

Key quotation

> *…disinterested and free satisfaction…*

Immanuel Kant, Critique of Judgement, § 5, paragraph beginning “We may say that of all these three kinds of satisfaction”, printed p. 54; J. H. Bernard translation, second revised edition 1914. Short fragment.

Connections between traditions

1. **Plato, Diotima’s concluding movement from particular forms to practices and knowledge; Ruskin, volume II, III.17.** Both widen the question beyond one attractive object: Plato changes the object of ascent; Ruskin distinguishes typical and vital beauty. The shared mechanism is identifying what is valued. This helps ask about an encounter’s significance without a premature comprehensive answer. The boundary is that enduring Platonic beauty and Ruskin’s expression of Divine attributes have different metaphysical grounds, rather than forming one demonstrated classification of experience.

2. **Kant, § 1; Plato, Diotima’s paragraph beginning “He who has been instructed thus far”.** Kant separates aesthetic judgment from cognition of an object; Plato asserts a particular being of beauty itself. Their shared question concerns the ground of a transition from beauty to significance. Comparison distinguishes an aesthetic response from a metaphysical conclusion. Precisely, Kant’s distinction does not prove Plato’s summit, and the speech is not empirical testimony for every viewer.

3. **Kant, § 5, attractive manners without virtue; Ruskin, XII.2, Christian charity.** Both place aesthetic and moral matters together, differently. Kant blocks inference from pleasing form to good will; Ruskin develops attention’s connection with charity within Christian grounds. The relevance is identifying where beauty prompts a moral question. The boundary is that form cannot certify conduct, while historical theology establishes no universal measure of human worth.

4. **Kant, § 2, interest in an object’s existence; Ruskin, XII.1, snow and Alpine flowers.** Kant distinguishes looking from interest in possession or existence; Ruskin’s living object introduces sympathy. The shared structure identifies a relationship to what is seen, distinguishing attention, wanting to possess and care. Pure judgment of taste and Christian moral relationship remain different; contemporary consent and access are separate editorial questions.

5. **Plato, Diotima’s practices and knowledge before absolute beauty; Ruskin, XII.1–2, a particular flower and charity.** Both connect the visible with a wider order of value. Plato arranges hierarchical ascent; Ruskin describes Christian sympathy for living things. They show different paths from encounter to a question about importance. Neither ancient bodily hierarchy nor historical descriptions of health are adopted as scales for valuing people today.

6. **Kant, § 4, flowers without a determinate concept; Ruskin, III.17, association and beauty proper.** Both distinguish the beauty considered from an attached account: Kant requires no determinate meaning for the form, while Ruskin separates his classification from association. Personal memory can therefore be discussed without calling it an object’s secret message.

Lived significance is our editorial question, replacing neither Kant’s pure judgment nor Ruskin’s theological definition.

Primary sources

Plato. Symposium, Diotima’s concluding sequence as reported by Socrates. Benjamin Jowett translation. Adopted paragraphs widen attention beyond one body, approach beauty itself and complete the speech; Project Gutenberg carrier: https://www.gutenberg.org/files/1600/1600-h/1600-h.htm . The epigraph is a fragment from “He who has been instructed thus far”. Ancient hierarchy and metaphysical claims remain the text’s grounds, rather than universal contemporary norms.

Immanuel Kant. Critique of Judgement, §§ 1–5 and the first moment’s concluding explanation. J. H. Bernard translation, second revised edition 1914; Project Gutenberg carrier: https://www.gutenberg.org/files/48433/48433-h/48433-h.htm . The key quotation is a short § 5 fragment, printed p. 54. Aesthetic judgment, interest and pleasant/beautiful/good distinctions are adopted, without therapeutic-effect research or proof of metaphysical conclusions.

John Ruskin. Modern Painters, volume II, part III, section I, chapter III, § 17, and chapter XII, §§ 1–2. Original English in the displayed Library Edition carrier: https://www.gutenberg.org/files/29906/29906-h/29906-h.htm . Adopted passages classify typical/vital beauty and discuss a flower, sympathy and Christian charity. The displayed edition’s separate date was not established from its title data; no independent whole-volume or botanical verification is claimed.

Russian quotations are United Wisdom’s own translations from the named Jowett and Bernard English translations. Ruskin was read in original English. Translators’ phrasing is not attributed to Greek or German originals. Comparisons are limited to the named passages; contemporary scenes and questions about consent, access and lived significance belong to the editorial argument.

Tags

beauty, meaning, aesthetics, attention, Plato, Symposium, Diotima, Kant, taste, Ruskin, sympathy, Christian charity, form, significance, memory, art, contemplation, judgment, cognition, interest, goodness, pleasant, beautiful, morality, tradition differences, consent, boundaries, authorship, lived significance, hypothetical example

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.