

UNITED WISDOM

Another person's life as a model: what can be learned, and what must be discovered for oneself

Meaning and Direction

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

P17 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Another person's life as a model: what can be learned, and what must be discovered for oneself

Epigraph

> *“Consider first, man, what the matter is.”*

— Epictetus, Enchiridion 29, first clause of the sentence considering the undertaking and one’s capacity, Elizabeth Carter translation. Source comma replaced by editorial closing period.

What this article is about

Another person's life sometimes reveals a possibility previously unnoticed: learning differently, listening more carefully, or choosing an activity for reasons beyond approval. Inspiration can also carry an entire outward pattern with it. Someone else's waking time, place of solitude or decisive turning point may become the measure of one's own path before their significance is understood. This essay distinguishes an example, a principle, a condition and a personal decision. An invented memoir reader helps us consider the difference between admiring a story and choosing an action. Limited passages from Epictetus, Marcus Aurelius and Augustine retain their different genres and grounds: philosophical counsel, personal recollection and Christian confession. They provide no single model of a spiritual biography. We consider what can be learned, where context is necessary, and why gratitude to an example requires no literal repetition of an entire life. The final exercise is voluntary; no ready answer about one's own path is assumed.

I. One account and two different tasks

Imagine Irina, an invented adult reader. She is reading a fictional memoir by someone who began each day with quiet reading for years and then spoke attentively with students. She admires both the routine and the author's willingness to acknowledge mistakes. Initially, Irina decides to rise at the same hour. After several days, her different evening work means the early start leaves inadequate rest. She feels she has lost the seriousness of her intention. This is not a studied case, and the routine is assigned to no historical author. The point is to notice that admiring attentiveness and reproducing a waking time have become two different tasks, whose relationship has yet to be established.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Her first response is understandable within the scene, but it is not yet a conclusion about her abilities. An unsuitable hour does not establish that attentive reading or listening is impossible. The opposite does not follow either: every alteration of a routine will necessarily preserve another person's practice. What attracted her, and what connection does she suppose between timing and attention? That connection might be important for the author, incidental, or unknown. Irina currently has one account. It permits a question; it does not by itself establish a general causal law or place the reader inside the same historical life. A failed imitation can therefore be examined without being made a complete verdict.

A more precise reading is already possible. Irina can distinguish an action's description, the author's explanation, and her own assumption about its result. If the memoirist connects mornings with solitude, that does not prove solitude possible only in the morning. If no connection is explained, the reader need not supply one as a compulsory rule. She can still enjoy the book and feel grateful for what it revealed. Attention to what is unknown does not spoil inspiration. It releases inspiration from immediately becoming an instruction and leaves room for a personal question. That question may concern listening rather than solitude, or learning rather than a timetable, without having to match the author's own question.

II. Inspiration begins a question

A useful example often first reveals a possibility. A reader notices that sharpness is not the only way to speak, or that a mistake can be acknowledged without an elaborate self-defence. This does not prove the reader can do the same in every situation. Yet between impossibility and guarantee lies substantial room: notice another way, understand its subject, and decide whether to explore it further. There another person's biography can broaden attention without taking a personal decision's place. An example may remain significant even if the reader chooses no corresponding way of life or retains a different answer to a religious question. Admiration need not settle every issue connected with the person admired.

The word example needs clarification here. It might mean a particular action, a way of relating to people, a teaching's content, or a well-known person's whole life. These subjects are not interchangeable. Admiration for a patient reply is not assent to all the speaker's convictions. Agreement with one argument does not make every action worthy of repetition. An account of spiritual conversion does not establish a compulsory story for every reader. Naming the example more precisely removes the need to accept or reject a person as a whole. Interest, disagreement and uncertainty can coexist without any one of them being presented as the final result of reading.

In the fictional memoir, Irina particularly values the author's willingness to return to a mistaken answer. She can name that feature without altering her waking time yet. The question becomes specific: what would returning to an answer mean in her own conversation, if such a

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

situation actually arose? Might a fact need clarification, an error acknowledgement, or an objection a hearing? This list demands neither an immediate confession nor compulsory openness. Sometimes no conversation exists yet; sometimes the other person does not want to continue it. Nevertheless, a personal decision gains its own subject instead of becoming a duty to appear like a student who has faithfully reproduced every visible feature of another person's routine.

III. Epictetus: examine the undertaking and its conditions

In Enchiridion 29, Epictetus contrasts enthusiasm for an observed example with examining an undertaking and its conditions. The section uses athletic contests and then philosophy. The identified Elizabeth Carter translation retains demanding Stoic requirements. This essay does not present them as contemporary advice to train, restrict food or end relationships. Its comparison concerns a narrower distinction: an attractive image of an activity and actually entering it are different subjects. One scene of another person's success does not disclose every condition. Conditions need investigation rather than imaginative assignment to someone else. The ancient argument retains its philosophical purpose, while the reader's present capacities and choices remain separate questions.

For Irina, this does not mean searching for a concealed price behind every good action. It means attending to a particular account. The fictional memoirist may have had a separate room, a different timetable or assistance; the book may say nothing about these. Missing information does not make an achievement false, but limits its transfer. If the reader changes her own day, she acts within her own situation and responds to conditions she knows. Someone else's earlier success cannot replace this work. That success can prompt interest without becoming a guarantee that the same result is available to everyone else. Investigation can remain modest instead of attempting to reconstruct an entire life before any choice is possible.

This examination has a limit too. Conditions need not become a requirement to know everything before permitting oneself any small action. A complete reconstruction of the author's life is unavailable and often unnecessary. A limited question and a proportionate way of clarifying it can be chosen. Irina might want to know whether the reading she admires depends on particular religious content or only on the way attention is described. That question needs text and context. Creating a similar outward appearance does not answer it. Where clarity is absent, she may continue reading, ask a competent interlocutor, or leave the decision open without declaring the pause proof of personal inadequacy.

IV. Marcus Aurelius: different people, different qualities

At the beginning of Meditations, Marcus Aurelius distinguishes what he learned from different relatives and teachers. Sections I–IV in the displayed Casaubon edition's local numbering include family examples and recollection of Rusticus. This is a personal record of gratitude, not complete biographies of those named. Its relevance is the limited subject of learning: the account singles out qualities and ways of approaching matters rather than requiring someone to become each person as a whole. It does not establish that every contemporary tradition permits freely changing all its forms. Our subject is how a particular author describes his own learning from particular people, with the edition's numbering and autobiographical genre retained.

Irina can likewise name different qualities she values in different accounts. She admires attentive reading in one person, clear acknowledgement of error in another, and unobtrusive help in a third. Such a list does not make her a composite replica of three biographies. Each example raises a separate question about her own action. Yet attractive labels cannot simply be collected and announced as qualities already acquired. Naming an interest in attention differs from actually reading a particular text attentively. Between them remain chosen work, personal experience, and the possibility of discovering that the initial picture was too general. The examples can guide a question without certifying its answer in advance.

Gratitude does not require a flawless model either. If Irina later finds a questionable decision in the memoir, she can consider it separately. It need not erase another passage's significance, but may require reconsidering how much confidence she places in the account. An attractive image should not be protected at the expense of a known fact; one fact should not become knowledge of an entire life. Specific gratitude is easier to retain when its subject is clear. Someone can remember where a useful question arose while disagreeing with the author's answer to another question. Learning then leaves room for judgement instead of converting gratitude into lifelong submission to a selected biography.

V. Augustine: an example within faith

In Confessions VIII.6, paragraphs 14–15, Augustine recounts a conversation with Pontitianus and an account of reading Antony's life. The selected scope includes different participants' responses and retains its explicit Christian frame. We read Pilkington's translation as revised on New Advent, not the complete historical Life of Antony. This matters: an account of reading a book is not independent verification of that book or every event it describes. The bounded comparison shows another person's story entering a personal decision; it establishes no universal conversion mechanism. This essay's reader need not repeat the account's changes of occupation, relationships or way of life. Those remain choices represented within a particular religious confession.

An example within faith cannot quietly become neutral self-improvement advice. The account addresses God and retains its understanding of service and change. This essay preserves those grounds even where a contemporary reader does not share them. Respectful reading nevertheless requires neither acknowledgement of the account's truth nor repetition of its decision. What a text says can be clarified before deciding how to relate to it. Understanding and assent remain distinct. That distinction protects the source from arbitrary substitution and the reader from a demand to accept another person's religious biography as a description of their own future. A disagreement can then concern the actual claim rather than an altered version made convenient for the reader.

Irina might encounter such an account and feel her own life lacks decisiveness. That feeling establishes no required decision. Perhaps she admires clarity of choice; perhaps she imagines every worthwhile path must begin with an abrupt turn. These are different questions. A clear subject need not require outward drama, and the absence of a turning-point scene does not prove the absence of serious searching. A historical account can remain an important interlocutor without occupying personal judgement's place. This essay does not consequently declare every path identical. Teachings, requirements and decisions retain differences that deserve separate consideration, rather than being flattened into one reassuring claim that every possible outcome means the same thing.

VI. A principle is not an outward form

Return to the fictional memoir. An early hour, a separate room and a particular notebook may be more noticeable than patience in conversation because they are easier to reproduce. Visibility does not establish a feature's significance, however. If Irina wants to understand the author's willingness to acknowledge mistakes, she needs to examine the described response and its circumstances. Buying a similar notebook does not report anything about that. It may be enjoyable and personally meaningful, but has a different subject. Keeping these distinctions does not forbid outward forms. It simply prevents a form from automatically certifying a quality not yet examined within one's own action or relationship.

A particular tradition may give a form obligatory significance of its own. Every rite cannot be declared an incidental shell in advance, retaining only what a contemporary reader enjoys. If Irina chooses an established practice, its content and conditions matter; an arbitrary alteration should not be presented as the same practice. If she takes only a question about attention from an account, that can honestly be called her own borrowing of a question. Such precision retains both freedom and provenance. Someone need not choose a tradition, but that freedom gives no ground for speaking on its behalf or declaring every difference of form irrelevant to its participants. An adaptation can retain its own name.

At this point a small independent choice becomes possible. Irina might read one short passage more carefully and check what she understood, without promising herself the memoirist's entire routine. She might notice that her question concerns listening to an objection rather than reading at all; the action would then change. Its significance is considered in relation to the chosen subject and known circumstances, rather than by outward similarity to someone else's day. No promise connects a small step to an eventual transformation. There is simply room to avoid demanding that one action certify an entire spiritual biography. The example continues to matter without making resemblance the only way a present decision can have meaning.

VII. What a biography does not disclose

A reader often sees an already narrated sequence: a difficulty, a decision and what the author later considers the result. Connections between events may remain unknown; some circumstances may never enter the book. This does not accuse a memoirist of dishonesty. An account has a chosen subject and limited length. Its coherence nevertheless does not automatically make every earlier event a necessary cause of the next. Irina can retain a distinction between the order of narration and an explanation of an outcome. She may be interested in how another person understands a life without turning a completed literary account into a guaranteed route for someone else. Reading can respect the account's form while recognising what it leaves unresolved.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

The alternatives available to the author at a particular moment may also be unknown. A later decision can appear obvious even where an account discloses little of earlier uncertainty. If Irina compares her open situation with another person's completed description, she compares different kinds of knowledge. She does not yet have an account of what her decision will bring. This is not a deficiency that must immediately be removed. The present can remain unfinished without a requirement to explain a future life as coherently as an author explains what already occurred. A decision retains its particular subject instead of becoming a competition between two attractive stories, one completed and one still being lived.

Uncertainty needs careful language. It is more precise to say that a selected passage connects reading with a changed outlook than to announce reading an established cause of such change for everyone. It is better to mark undescribed circumstances than invent a convenient explanation. Where necessary, a question can be investigated further, but this essay demands no endless verification of every recollection. Missing information simply should not be used as proof of universal transferability. This restraint retains an example's possible usefulness without giving it authority to cancel one's own known conditions, undertakings or ways of obtaining necessary assistance. It supports a proportionate inquiry rather than either unquestioning imitation or wholesale suspicion.

VIII. The effect of resemblance on other people

Another person's path may include changes affecting others: new working hours, different communication or withdrawal from earlier tasks. In our invented scene, Irina decides to read in the evening and asks her housemate not to speak to her during that hour. The housemate has needs and existing agreements of her own. Irina's inspiration creates no automatic assent from another person. A change requiring a shared decision needs discussion as a change rather than presentation as evidence of an elevated path. A spiritual reason may be personally significant, but does not establish that others already agreed to participate in the chosen form. They remain participants in their own circumstances rather than background figures in Irina's imitation.

Precision protects the choice itself too. If Irina says she wants to try another reading time, her housemate understands the suggestion's subject. If she announces that she now lives like the book's central figure, a much larger request may be inferred. The other person may be expected to show special deference to a routine, assent to an explanation, and withhold questions of her own. Such expectations do not follow from one inspired reading. Personal significance can be described separately from a request for a particular condition. Declining that condition need not mean denying the person's value or the significance of their interest in spiritual life. The proposal can remain specific enough for genuine disagreement to be possible.

There are also situations in which someone genuinely needs to withdraw from earlier participation. This essay requires neither preserving every agreement for outward consistency nor enduring danger. Where calm discussion is available, however, another person's biography need not be presented as the agent who already decided for us. Irina can state her decision and its known consequences honestly. She need not establish that a historical author would have made precisely the same choice. Her choice remains hers; reference to an example reports where a question arose rather than transferring responsibility for present life and relationships to it. Necessary support keeps its own significance, and a philosophical comparison does not settle every practical condition of withdrawal.

IX. A personal answer without compulsory uniqueness

Independence need not mean inventing something nobody has done before. Irina might choose ordinary attentive reading and recognise something from another person's example within it. That does not remove her participation. What matters is understanding the subject, known conditions and what she actually accepts. Conversely, an outwardly unusual choice does not become independent merely through difference. An example can be rejected as automatically as it can be copied. Between repetition and compulsory originality remain considered assent, partial borrowing, a question or refusal. None needs to be selected for an overall rating of spiritual maturity. A personal answer may resemble another's while still being chosen in relation to an understood present situation.

A small step may alter understanding of the original example. Reading more carefully, Irina notices that the routine mattered less than the author's return to a difficult question. Later she may recognise that this quality also has limits or requires different conditions. Such change need not betray the initial inspiration. Inspiration began an inquiry rather than a contract never to change its wording. A question's origin can be retained while its answer is reconsidered. The book need not be declared empty or its author perfect. What was read, what was assumed, and what became clearer through a limited personal experience can be distinguished without forcing that experience to confirm the original picture.

Sometimes no personal answer has appeared yet. Someone keeps reading, chooses no practice, or realises that the relevant question belongs elsewhere. This essay appoints no deadline by which another person's biography must produce a clear result. Unfinished understanding may remain an honest state of knowledge. An open question nevertheless does not cancel known facts or prevent notifying others about a particular change in participation. Nothing need be added to a spiritual narrative for today's decision to be communicated clearly. A personal path here means participation in judgement, rather than a requirement to possess a completed story that can immediately be displayed as proof of having found oneself or arrived at a final identity.

X. Learning while preserving differences

In our scene, a biography is useful when it makes Irina's question clearer, rather than making her life increasingly resemble someone else's. This does not forbid following a tradition or serious study with a teacher. A chosen form may have real requirements to understand and freely consider within one's decision. Even assent to an established form does not make two biographies one, however. Participants retain different circumstances, histories and responses. Attentive following therefore differs from reproducing every detail literally. A reader can study content without promising to repeat every episode an author regarded as important to their account. The distinction allows commitment to have a precise subject instead of extending silently to an entire represented life.

The three selected sources remain different interlocutors. Epictetus helps identify conditions of an undertaking; Marcus describes learning from different people in a particular way; Augustine retains an example within Christian address to God. These observations do not prove that the sources teach the same thing. They permit this essay's limited questions about learning from another life. Understanding each tradition further requires its own text and context. The contemporary scene belongs to editorial reasoning rather than a common experiment found in all three sources. Keeping those subjects distinct does not impoverish dialogue. It makes visible where a comparison is actually being drawn and where another question begins, with grounds that cannot simply be borrowed from the neighbouring source.

Irina remains free to retain the example, change the question or stop the attempt. Neither gratitude to a book nor an unsuccessful routine becomes a final verdict on her life. Clarity of scale matters more: what possibility she noticed, which conditions she knows, and what action she actually chooses. Another person's biography can supply language for a question without writing its answer in advance. Personal participation need not begin by rejecting every model. It begins where admiration is no longer presented as a decision already made, and where hearing, understanding, choosing and remaining uncertainty can be distinguished honestly. This work requires neither a perfect copy nor compulsory proof that one's own life is exceptional.

What this means in practice

If you wish to continue, choose one small example from a book or an ordinary recollection. No difficult history, assessment of an entire life or declaration of a spiritual model is required. Record what attracted you: an action, a response, a thought, a practice's form or an outward routine. If the subject is unclear, it can remain so. Then distinguish what the text reports from your own assumption. Unknown circumstances need not be supplied by guesses in order to retain a passage's significance.

Clarify one question about conditions. Does the example concern particular religious content or an established form? Are there actual requirements still unexamined? If you choose only a question about attention, it can honestly remain your own question rather than represent an entire tradition. There is no need to copy a timetable, bodily restriction or historical withdrawal from relationships for resemblance. Where a next step requires necessary assistance, a philosophical record replaces none of it.

If wanted, identify one available small action, or choose not to continue now. Consider whether it affects an existing agreement: inspiration creates no other person's automatic assent. No result or deadline for clarity is guaranteed. Gratitude to an example can remain while an initial plan changes. This is a voluntary editorial exercise in philosophical attention, neither diagnosis nor a spiritual examination or proven method of changing a life. Its efficacy is not established. The record remains yours, and the choice requires neither ideal repetition of another biography nor a display of exceptional originality.

Key quotation

> *“If you are reluctant to imitate me, hinder me not.”*

— Augustine, Confessions VIII.6 paragraph15, words of a participant in Pontitianus's account, not Augustine addressing the reader; J. G. Pilkington translation revised on New Advent.

Connections between traditions

Question	Both textual bases and locators	Mechanism, difference and boundary
The subject of inspiration	Epictetus, Enchiridion 29: an attractive image of an undertaking is considered alongside its conditions; Marcus, book I, local sections I–IV in the Casaubon edition: different qualities of relatives and teachers are named.	The first text requires examination of a Stoic undertaking; the second expresses personal gratitude to particular people. The comparison helps this essay distinguish a selected quality from an entire biography. It establishes neither that every form of learning can dispense with requirements nor that the reader has already acquired the qualities listed.
Different responses to an example	Augustine VIII.6 paragraphs14–15: Pontitianus's account includes reading Antony's life and participants' differing responses; Epictetus 29: observation and enthusiasm are followed by examination of an undertaking.	The Christian confession retains address to God; Stoic counsel considers conditions of philosophical choice. The contemporary scene can thus distinguish hearing an example from making a decision. This does not turn conversion into a neutral technique or guarantee that the same book produces the same response in different people.
A person and a limited quality	Marcus, local I–IV: the personal record names different subjects of learning, including careful reading from Rusticus; Augustine VIII.6 paragraphs14–15: an account of another person enters a particular religious change.	Gratitude for a quality and an account of a changed life have different scales. Their comparison clarifies what a reader wants to learn without requiring acceptance of a whole person. It supplies no complete biographies of those named and warrants no conclusion that every teacher's decision is justified.
Choice and another person's participation	Augustine VIII.6 paragraph15: a participant distinguishes his choice from another's imitation; Epictetus 29: an undertaking's conditions are considered before entering it.	The Christian account concerns a particular decision to serve God; Epictetus's counsel concerns Stoic consistency. Applied editorially to Irina's agreement, the comparison makes her request's subject visible. It establishes neither a requirement to repeat historical withdrawal from relationships nor her housemate's assent to a present change.

Question	Both textual bases and locators	Mechanism, difference and boundary
Outward similarity and content	Epictetus 29: changing enthusiasms after observed examples is contrasted with examining an undertaking; Marcus, local IV: recollection of Rusticus includes avoiding display and reading carefully.	Counsel and recollection differ in genre and addressee. Together they permit a question about a chosen form's meaning before a similar routine is taken as evidence of a quality. They do not establish that every religious rite is incidental or that arbitrary alteration retains an established practice's content.
An account's limits	Marcus, local I–IV: the author describes learning received; Augustine VIII.6 paragraphs14–15: a participant's account is transmitted within confession and prayerful address.	Both selected texts offer particular accounts rather than independent reconstruction of every circumstance. This essay distinguishes what is reported, how an author understands it, and a contemporary assumption about transfer. This is neither an accusation of dishonesty, verification of the entire Life of Antony, nor a general causal law of biographical influence.

Primary sources

1. Epictetus, complete Enchiridion29. Elizabeth Carter translation identified by MIT. The whole section considering an undertaking and its conditions, and the edition heading, were read. Ancient requirements supply no medical norm or compulsory rule for ending relationships.

2. Marcus Aurelius, Meditations bookI, local sectionsI–IV. Edited Meric Casaubon translation; the complete selected passage and note concerning the1634/1635 edition were read. This English page's numbering differs from common Greek-text numbering. Complete biographies of the people named were not verified.

3. Augustine, Confessions VIII.6, paragraphs14–15. J. G. Pilkington translation as revised on New Advent, with stated1887 publication details. The complete selected scope of Pontitianus's account and publication information were read. The Life of Antony itself was not read or independently verified.

English quotations were checked against the named English translations; Russian quotations are United Wisdom's own translations from those editions. Editorial closing punctuation in the first short quotation is marked separately. Different philosophical and religious grounds remain distinct. The contemporary scene and voluntary exercise are editorial; their efficacy is not established.

Tags

biography, example, inspiration, imitation, choice, path, tradition, practice, agency, attention, reading, memoir, conditions, circumstances, principle, form, routine, decision, assent, gratitude, question, uncertainty, differences, Epictetus, Marcus Aurelius, Augustine, Antony, Pontitianus, Stoicism, faith

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.