

UNITED WISDOM

When a calling changes

Meaning and Direction

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

P18 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

When a calling changes

Epigraph

> *I do not teach; I only relate.*

Michel de Montaigne. Essays, III.2, “Of Repentance”, Charles Cotton translation, William Carew Hazlitt edition,1877.

What this article is about

A calling can connect work, relationships and a person’s account of themselves for a long time. A change can therefore feel larger than changing an activity: an earlier explanation of life no longer persuades, while another is not ready. This article distinguishes changes to an aim, participation and conditions; earlier sincerity and present disagreement; a personal decision and commitments to others. Montaigne, Marcus Aurelius and Ecclesiastes supply separate grounds for reflection, retaining their historical, Stoic and religious contexts. They do not become a test of a correct occupation. Contemporary scenes explore describing change without dismissing an entire biography or promising final self-discovery. A result can be a more precise conversation about what differs, what retains significance and which next question still needs information or help.

I. An earlier explanation no longer seems sufficient

Sometimes a person continues to do familiar work well, yet their earlier explanation no longer answers why they want to do it. Work once seemed a calling; now the word sounds like a promise they find difficult to repeat. This moment does not automatically reveal a mistaken choice or mean that leaving is necessary. It identifies a narrower difficulty: the relationship between an activity and what the person considers important has changed. That change can first be described. What no longer persuades them: the result, the arrangement of the work, their role or an earlier picture of the future? Greater precision reduces the need to pass judgement on an entire biography. A particular disagreement need not become a final explanation of oneself.

Consider a teacher who once particularly enjoyed speaking to a large group. Later, attentive conversations with individual learners become more important, and the public role feels different. The earlier interest need not have been pretence. Perhaps the desired form of participation has changed; perhaps the present arrangement poorly supports the earlier aim. These possibilities invite different questions. One concerns the substance of significant work; the other concerns its conditions. They can be discussed while respecting what was

previously accomplished. Learners who benefited do not disappear from the story because the teacher now describes their direction differently. Their gratitude also does not predetermine the form or duration of future participation.

A change of calling here means reconsidering what counts as significant participation and how a person intends to express it. It names neither a diagnosis nor a compulsory stage of development. It may concern an occupation, a public undertaking, learning, care or creative work; a change need not require a different job. The discussion distinguishes present grounds, earlier sincerity and actual obligations to others. Older philosophical texts help raise particular questions, rather than provide a test of a correct calling. Contemporary scenes remain hypothetical examples. Readers are urged neither to change their lives immediately nor to preserve an earlier form forever as proof of fidelity to themselves. A more precise conversation can itself be an outcome of reflection.

II. Earlier sincerity and present disagreement

When a present wish differs from an earlier one, there is a temptation to declare the past unreal. The new story then seems convincing only if the old one was a mistake. Sincerity, however, also belongs to the circumstances, knowledge and possibilities of a particular time. A person may really have valued an activity, recognised its contribution and accepted its difficulties. The same grounds may now be insufficient. This distinction excuses neither every earlier action nor any harm done. It separates assessment of a choice from the honesty of the relationship to it at that time. Reconsidering direction does not always require proving that all earlier commitment was a lie finally exposed by today’s decision.

At the opening of “Of Repentance”, Montaigne describes a changing person and relates his account to the moment of observation. He allows for a change of intention and acknowledges continued learning. This belongs to his practice of self-description, rather than a rule for career transitions. Questions of conscience and the judgement of actions remain beside change in the chapter; movement is not declared good in itself. A contemporary reader can then ask, in their own name, whether two periods can be described without requiring one to erase the other. This use preserves the boundary between a historical author and present reflection. Montaigne does not decide which promises a reader may reconsider or which consequences must be accepted.

Someone may have organised local events for years and sincerely valued bringing neighbours together. Later they want to pursue quiet research. They can recognise the earlier contribution and present difference without calling themselves a fraud. Specific questions still remain: who expects another season, what has already been promised and which knowledge needs to be passed on? Gratitude for the past does not answer them automatically, while a wish for change does not make them irrelevant. The account becomes more candid when three statements

stand together: this mattered to me; this is what has changed; this responsibility to people remains. There may be tension among them that an elegant name for a new stage cannot immediately resolve.

III. The activity, the form of participation or the conditions

The phrase I no longer want this can describe several changes. A person may cease to value the result itself, prefer a different role or encounter conditions in which an earlier meaning is difficult to sustain. Distinguishing these possibilities helps before making a general judgement about a calling. An interest in teaching, for example, may remain while constant organisational work displaces encounters with learners. Dissatisfaction may then concern the arrangement of participation. In another case, the person no longer shares the aim for which the classes were created. Rearranging the timetable will not settle that central question. These descriptions are not a strict classification of personality. They help explain which change is at issue and what information a discussion still needs.

Personal possibilities can change as well. What was manageable may now require another form; what was inaccessible may become closer through experience or support. This does not establish a universal promise of growth. Possibilities sometimes expand, sometimes narrow and sometimes move in both directions at once. If an earlier activity becomes difficult, describing its conditions should not be replaced with moral blame. Equally, a new possibility does not create an obligation to pursue it. A person can compare the significance of participation, actual limits and relationships affected without demanding that every change prove continuous improvement. A life’s direction need not be a report of constantly increasing efficiency or public scale.

In a hypothetical scene, a community participant wants to stop leading weekly meetings while continuing to help with their content. The role changes, although the shared undertaking still matters. Others may consider that contribution insufficient. This is an actual disagreement about expectations, rather than ready proof of betrayal of a calling. It helps to describe which part the person is willing to retain, which they no longer promise and what others previously expected. The absence of an acceptable agreement can also be acknowledged. A role does not always change smoothly or receive immediate approval from everyone. Reflection aims to make grounds and consequences visible so that people discuss specific participation rather than compete to define another person’s identity finally.

IV. Fatigue need not explain the whole change

When familiar work loses its attraction, one convenient explanation can seem sufficient: this is merely fatigue, or this is definitely a new calling. Neither becomes correct simply by sounding decisive. Fatigue can affect a relationship to work, but this article establishes neither its causes nor distinctions between medical conditions. The question stays at an accessible scale: how has participation changed, which circumstances are known and what remains unclear? Appropriate professional help may be needed where health or persistent difficulties in everyday life are involved. Seeking it does not require first proving that an earlier calling was false. Such help also offers no guaranteed answer about meaning, an occupation or the only permissible future.

A person can describe two observations separately: familiar tasks are difficult after a demanding period, and the earlier aim of the work no longer persuades them. These observations may be related, but a single conversation does not establish the connection. Each should not automatically become an explanation of the other. Information about demands may need clarification; the question of aims may remain even under different conditions. No predetermined waiting period is required before a desire for change counts as authentic. A particular decision needs sufficient grounds and clarity about what cannot yet be claimed. Where serious commitments are affected, acknowledging uncertainty helps discuss a proportionate next step while keeping the question open at its actual scale.

Reflection may produce a clearer account of a difficulty rather than a choice of another activity. For example: helping learners still matters, but the current form leaves too little room for attentive conversation. This is more substantive than declaring that a calling has vanished, although it guarantees no improvement in conditions. Another possible result is that conditions have become clearer while the aim itself remains unsuitable. Both answers may require further discussion. Their difference guards against hurried devaluation and an equally hurried return to the earlier explanation. A person need not prove eternal devotion because a difficulty has several causes, nor declare a final change before understanding the situation sufficiently.

V. Reconsidering a ground and acknowledging an error

In Meditations VI.21, Marcus Aurelius expresses willingness to revise judgement or action when someone convincingly reveals an error. His concern is truth within Stoic ethics, rather than changing an occupation whenever it becomes uncomfortable. A useful distinction is between persistence for the sake of an earlier self-image and attention to the ground of an action. A contemporary reader raises their own question: which objection have I actually heard, and what does it change? Referring to the author does not establish that objection's validity. Its content still needs examination, with a distinction between a demonstrated error, disagreement and an unknown circumstance. The philosophical passage supplies a question, not a verdict on a present calling.

Imagine someone who arranged learning because they believed one method suited every participant equally. Later they receive specific evidence that some learners are excluded. The method can be reconsidered without abandoning the value of learning. They may also discover that the earlier role served an aim they now regard as unacceptable. That is a deeper change, but its content needs naming rather than replacement with the word awakening. Where mistakes occurred, correction matters in its own right. A new account of a calling does not remove the need to discuss earlier consequences. Acknowledging an error also does not require declaring every past result useless or treating the person as incapable of more careful action.

Other people's objections deserve attention, but disapproval is not always evidence. Some may discuss consequences, others the disruption of a familiar image and others their own expectations. These grounds differ. It helps to clarify what is being reconsidered and why. A person may accept part of an observation while disagreeing with its general conclusion. That position need not be evasion. It allows specific responsibility to be accepted without giving another person authority to define an entire biography finally. A change of calling may include acknowledging an error, but can also occur without it as an important activity changes significance, relationships or form. Confusing these cases demands repentance where a precise conversation about present grounds may be needed first.

VI. Losing a familiar name

The name of a calling can connect many relationships. Someone is known as a teacher, craftsperson, organiser or researcher; that name brings invitations to participate and explains their contribution. When the relationship to the activity changes, the difficulty concerns more than future tasks. Introducing oneself, speaking with former colleagues and recognising one's contribution may become less straightforward. Such uncertainty proves neither that the change is wrong nor that a new choice is right. A particular loss can be acknowledged: a familiar name no longer fully describes my participation. This makes room to discuss the significance of the earlier circle and role without immediately inventing a new identity expected to close every question with one convincing word.

Consider someone who stops leading a creative studio while retaining an interest in the art itself. At gatherings, questions about the studio keep recalling a role they no longer promise. They can communicate the change without an extended defence while not requiring others to forget the earlier story immediately. If people keep allocating tasks as though nothing changed, participation needs clearer explanation. Not wanting to retain a position can coexist with wanting to retain relationships. These wishes may be difficult to reconcile, but they are not necessarily contradictory. An earlier name can remain part of an account even when it no longer accurately identifies today's role or future commitments.

Leaving a form of participation need not be ceremonial or bring immediate relief. A person can recognise the need for change while missing the familiar arrangement. No rule is offered for how long that mixed experience should last. What matters is not treating loss as a final judgement on the decision. It reveals the significance of something connected with the earlier activity without automatically deciding what must be restored. Missing closeness, a familiar rhythm or a chance to contribute can be named separately. Sometimes this reveals relationships worth maintaining differently; sometimes no clear answer is available. Acknowledging loss supports a more candid conversation, preserving the past without an obligation to return to every former arrangement.

VII. Commitments do not disappear with an explanation

Changing one’s relationship to an activity concerns a personal ground for participation. Commitments to others also have grounds in promises, agreements and shared work depending on a contribution. The statement this is no longer my calling therefore does not settle how a transition should happen. What a person no longer wishes to promise in future differs from what they have already undertaken. This is not a demand to retain a former role indefinitely. Some expectations may lack justification, and some agreements may need reconsidering. Their substance still needs establishing rather than dissolving it into a general story of personal change. Philosophical reflection does not replace appropriate professional advice about legal or financial obligations and supplies no ready exit strategy.

Suppose someone preparing a shared exhibition now wants to concentrate on another activity. The news matters, but other participants still need information about the specific contribution. What has been completed, what remains, which material is available and which promise needs renewed discussion? These questions do not reduce a calling to a list of tasks. They recognise that a personal decision has consequences in a shared space. An acceptable transition may require knowledge to be passed on; people may discover that an earlier expectation was never agreed. In either case, clarity helps more than claiming that a new meaning of life automatically cancels old relationships. Clarity guarantees no easy agreement and does not remove anyone’s right to disagree.

Responsibility also concerns the limits of a promise. A person can explain that they cannot guarantee their earlier level of participation, even without knowing a final new form. This is a more candid ground for discussion than silently sustaining expectations they no longer accept. Others can describe consequences for themselves, and those consequences deserve attention. Their concern does not become authority to assign someone a calling forever. Two independent tasks meet here: respecting the significance of shared work and avoiding an inaccurate description of one’s participation. Their balance depends on actual circumstances rather than a universal formula. A next step may be discussion of a more precise promise and the conditions in which it can actually be kept, rather than departure.

VIII. A time of change and its religious ground

The opening of Ecclesiastes 3 associates human activities with different times. Birth and death, building and breaking down, weeping and laughter appear beside one another. Later verses return to God’s action and the limits of human understanding. The familiar sentence about a season therefore cannot become universal permission for any transition. It belongs to biblical reflection on life before God, rather than a timetable for occupational change. A reader can consider differences between periods while retaining the source’s ground. Someone who does not share that religious worldview need not present it as their own. Comparison remains possible without claiming that every tradition says the same thing or explains changes of calling in the same way.

Consider a person recognising that an earlier form of care for relatives no longer meets their present needs. Time and circumstances may matter, but a specific answer requires conversation with the relatives themselves. A verse does not identify a fair arrangement or allocate responsibility. A believer’s reflection may include their relationship to God; another participant may use different grounds for care. They can discuss available participation without requiring full agreement about their worldviews. Similar questions about change do not erase differences between sources. They allow recognition that an earlier form mattered while still needing reconsideration, with consequences that no attractive quotation about a new season determines by itself.

Turning to a tradition can support reflection, but it can also close discussion: if a new season has arrived, nobody should ask questions. That conclusion is supplied by the speaker rather than established by the verse considered. A personal decision and its grounds need naming separately. Religious language does not replace explaining what someone will do, what they cease to promise and how they understand relationships affected. Nor must it become a way to pressure another participant. Respect for a source includes recognising limits to its contemporary application. Differences between periods can then help reflection on time while leaving room for specific responsibility, disagreement and information an ancient text cannot provide about a present situation or a decision’s outcome.

IX. A new direction without an immediate final name

Reconsidering an earlier explanation does not always produce a ready new calling. A person may know which participation no longer fits while not yet understanding the form they want next. This asymmetry does not make the decision empty, but it requires precision. What is established, what is tentative and what remains open? A conversation, an encounter with different work or limited participation that creates no disproportionate promise may be available. These can supply information rather than serve as compulsory rituals of self-discovery. Where such possibilities are absent, missing experience should remain unknown. Neither imagined success nor an attractive name replaces actual knowledge of an activity’s content, conditions and consequences for other participants.

Imagine a researcher who no longer wants their earlier public role but has not identified future participation. Two conversations can be separated. One concerns changes to the current promise; the other concerns further direction. The second need not always be answered before any clarification of the first. Where a present decision affects others substantially, that dependence needs specific consideration. An intermediate account can be candid: I retain this contribution and am discussing a change to this role; I make no promise yet about the next major undertaking. This is not a universal transition plan. It shows that uncertainty about the future can coexist with precision about current responsibility, although reconciling them may be difficult and take further discussion.

Openness also differs from a hidden promise of inevitable discovery. I am still searching may leave room for varied outcomes or quietly assume that one final answer must soon arrive. The article promises no such answer. A person may find an important undertaking, sustain several forms of participation or arrive at a more modest account of present life. These possibilities need not be ranked in advance by the supposed authenticity of a personality. A direction’s significance concerns its content, grounds and consequences, rather than only the intensity of a declared feeling. Real interest can be recognised while leaving unanswered questions open, without turning every pause into evidence of inadequate determination or a concealed mistake.

X. A coherent life can include revisions

An account of calling often aims to connect events into one clear line. Such an explanation can illuminate choices, but can also demand that every earlier activity led to today's answer. Change then becomes permissible only as disclosure of a hidden plan that always existed. Not everyone can honestly tell that story. Sometimes direction actually changes rather than revealing an unchanging essence. Another kind of coherence can be recognised: memory of significant participation, willingness to correct error and attention to consequences and relationships. It guarantees no smooth biography. It permits an account of changes without requiring each to become a necessary stage on a predetermined path that supposedly could never have unfolded differently.

Montaigne leaves room for a changing narrator; Marcus Aurelius raises correction of judgement; Ecclesiastes places different times within religious reflection. Their grounds remain distinct. None of the passages considered proves that every new desire should be carried out immediately. The contemporary conclusion belongs to the editorial argument: change can be described through what differs, what retains significance and to whom responsibility remains. This language permits disagreement and limits to knowledge. A person need not secure every listener's approval, but can offer discussable grounds rather than demand recognition of a new calling. They can also acknowledge that a next step remains unidentified and that further reflection needs other information or help.

The question of when a calling changes need not require a date after which an earlier life becomes a mistake. It can begin a conversation about how present participation relates to current values and actual conditions. Gratitude, disagreement, loss and reconsidered promises can all have a place. They may not be reconciled at once. One precise distinction can be useful where general unease previously stood: the role changes while the aim remains; the aim changes while responsibility persists; earlier sincerity survives although its explanation no longer fits. A next step can then be discussed with room for revision. A life needs no unchanging name for its actions and relationships to remain significant and worthy of careful consideration.

What this means in practice

Choose one change you can discuss now without settling an entire biography. First describe the earlier participation: what you did, why it mattered, who benefited and which commitments were undertaken. Then name the present difference separately. Has the aim, desired role or available arrangement changed, or is it only clear that an earlier explanation no longer persuades? Where a cause is not established, leave it as a question rather than completing a confident story.

Try three short statements: this mattered to me before; my relationship to this now differs; this responsibility to others remains. Compare them with specific circumstances. Earlier sincerity and present disagreement can be recognised together. Name mistakes or consequences requiring attention separately. A changed calling neither excuses every past action nor establishes that all earlier contributions were empty.

Finally, choose one next question for a conversation: clarify current conditions, discuss the limits of a promise, learn about another form of participation or seek appropriate help. This is an editorial reflection practice, rather than a validated transition method. It identifies no occupation, replaces no medical, legal or financial consultation and requires no immediate decision. The result may be recognition that another direction has not yet been found. Even then, it may be possible to explain more precisely what you actually know, what you no longer promise and which relationships should be considered in further discussion.

Key quotation

> *To every thing there is a season, and a time to every purpose under the heaven:*

Ecclesiastes3:1, King James Version, displayed KJV Standard edition. This biblical reflection concerns time before God; the verse identifies no date for changing an occupation.

Connections between traditions

Comparison is limited to the named passages about change, judgement and time. Personal observation, Stoic ethics and the biblical relationship with God retain different grounds.

Question	Specific sides of the comparison	Limited resemblance	Difference and boundary of application
Change and different times	Montaigne III.2, the opening: portraying passage and a changing person; Ecclesiastes3:1–8: different times and opposing activities.	Both permit human life to extend beyond a single fixed moment or activity.	Montaigne describes himself and his way of writing; the biblical sequence belongs to religious reflection on time. They form no common schedule of career stages or permission to change agreements without discussion.

Question	Specific sides of the comparison	Limited resemblance	Difference and boundary of application
Changing description and correcting judgement	Montaigne III.2, the opening: the moving subject of his account; Marcus Aurelius VI.21: readiness to change action when an error is demonstrated.	A present understanding of someone or an undertaking need not be final merely because it was stated earlier.	Montaigne's description of change makes no claim that every change is right; the Stoic passage requires grounds in truth rather than disapproval alone. The essay distinguishes changed conditions from correction of an error.
Grounds for a human decision	Marcus Aurelius VI.21: seeking truth and accepting a demonstrated objection; Ecclesiastes3:14: the duration of God's work and reverence before God.	Both place evaluation beyond a wish to preserve one's earlier statement.	Marcus considers correcting human judgement; Ecclesiastes speaks of God's action. Divine order becomes no testable career forecast, and Stoic correction establishes no general identity between these grounds.
An undertaking and the value of participation	Ecclesiastes3:9–13: toil, good and God's gift; Marcus Aurelius VI.21: truth matters more than persisting in error.	Both allow a question about acting and its grounds rather than an impressive life-role label alone.	Enjoyment of work as a biblical gift differs from the Stoic requirement to correct an error. Neither establishes the efficacy of contemporary practice or requires every activity to continue forever.

Question	Specific sides of the comparison	Limited resemblance	Difference and boundary of application
An account's limits and responsibility	Montaigne III.2, the opening: portraying a particular person rather than constructing a universal model; Ecclesiastes3:10–11: human occupation and limits of comprehending God's work.	Both retain limits of human description and prevent a present account from exhausting an entire life.	Montaigne's particular self-portrait is not identical with the religious question of God's work and limits of human understanding. Acknowledging incompleteness cancels no consequences of earlier actions; present promises and transitions require their actual conditions to be considered.

Primary sources

1. Michel de Montaigne. Essays, III.2, “Of Repentance”. Charles Cotton translation, William Carew Hazlitt edition,1877; Project Gutenberg3600. Opening and epigraph.

2. Marcus Aurelius. Meditations, VI.21, George Long translation. Revising judgement when an error is convincingly shown; neighbouring VI.20–23.

3. Ecclesiastes3:1–14, King James Version. Key quotation3:1; God’s action and limits of understanding in3:10–14.

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

calling, change, direction, meaning, biography, sincerity, values, aim, role, participation, conditions, responsibility, promise, commitments, past, future, uncertainty, loss, relationships, work, learning, care, creativity, Montaigne, Marcus Aurelius, Ecclesiastes, conscience, correction, autonomy, time

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.