

UNITED WISDOM

Leaving a community: retaining experience while changing belonging

Meaning and Direction

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

P19 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Leaving a community: retaining experience while changing belonging

Epigraph

“We still carry our fetters along with us.”

— Michel de Montaigne, Of Solitude, chapterXXXVIII in the Cotton/Hazlitt1877 edition, sentence after the Persius chain quotation. Identified English translation; historical metaphor, not diagnosis.

What this article is about

Leaving a community changes participation, but does not automatically rewrite years spent with people. Knowledge, friendships, habits and important questions may have arisen there; disagreement and matters someone no longer wants to revisit may remain too. Retaining experience does not mean justifying everything past, and changing belonging need not declare the past empty. This essay considers a personal transition through an invented adult participant in reading meetings. It distinguishes participation, conviction, gratitude, obligation and the choice not to continue a conversation. Limited passages from Montaigne, Marcus Aurelius and John's Gospel remain different interlocutors: reflection on solitude, personal recollection of learning and Christian narrative. They establish no common rule for leaving. Group structures and judgements about leadership lie beyond this subject. The voluntary final exercise clarifies one present question without requiring a final explanation of an entire spiritual biography.

I. The book remains on the shelf

Imagine Sergei, an invented adult who attended a small reading gathering. For several years he discussed spiritual texts there and helped prepare tea. He has now decided to stop attending regularly: some grounds of the discussions no longer speak to him. At home remain an annotated book and a message from an acquaintance asking whether they will meet separately. Sergei notices opposing wishes: put away everything recalling the meetings, or keep his earlier routine to avoid seeming ungrateful. This is an invented philosophical scene, not a studied case. The known subjects are a decision about meetings, a book and an invitation. None determines the meaning of all the preceding years for him.

The decision's scale matters first. Sergei is no longer attending particular meetings. He has not yet decided about every friendship, every idea read or every habit of his own. Someone may

indeed want to end all related contacts; that choice is possible too. But it has its own subject and need not silently accompany every change of participation. A more precisely named action requires less overall judgement of the past. A changed timetable, rejection of a conviction and ending a personal relationship remain distinct even when they occur together. They may be considered separately where that is available and wanted, without requiring a person to retain contact for the sake of a tidy account.

The book likewise requires no immediate verdict. Sergei may keep it on the shelf, put it away or return to a passage later. An object's position need not prove loyalty or freedom. Retaining annotations does not necessarily mean agreeing with an earlier interpretation. Putting the book away does not establish that the years of participation meant nothing. In this scene, assigning each gesture a smaller, specific subject makes another question visible: what remains understood, what prompts objection, and what presently needs no decision? An account everyone accepts is unnecessary. The book can remain a book rather than becoming the sole witness called upon to certify Sergei's entire transition.

II. Belonging and conviction change differently

Belonging includes participation in a particular form of life: meetings, familiar words, shared activities and sometimes a stated status. Conviction concerns what someone considers true and on what grounds. The subjects are connected but do not automatically coincide. Sergei may stop attending while still valuing an idea encountered there. He may retain a friendship while rejecting an earlier explanation. A conviction may change before an outward routine does. This distinction describes neither every community's structure nor other participants' inward lives. It simply prevents one sign of belonging from answering every question about a personal transition at once, as though attendance itself fully reported what someone understands or accepts.

A question such as whether Sergei is still with the others may need clarification. It could concern attendance, disagreement with a teaching or ending relationships with everyone he knew. Interlocutors can address different subjects without noticing. If he wants to reply, he can name the particular change and leave other questions open. He need not disclose every ground for his decision or prove sufficient respect. Clear notice about attendance at a previously arranged meeting nevertheless has a practical subject of its own. It lets others understand present participation without becoming a test of the correctness of his spiritual choice. A limited message can be enough even where no wider account is available.

Conversely, a retained conviction does not automatically require return to the same participation. A question may continue through reading, another conversation, or without a selected form for now. A particular tradition has its own understanding of community and practice; this essay cancels none of it. Explaining that understanding differs from adopting it.

Sergei can investigate the difference without claiming to speak for an entire tradition. Personal change needs precise language rather than an assertion that every teaching supports every form of independence. A future path can remain unknown, while the present decision retains a sufficiently clear subject for someone to act or decline participation.

III. Montaigne: changing place does not settle the question

In the selected opening of Of Solitude, Montaigne considers what a person carries when withdrawing from a familiar setting. We read the Cotton translation edited by Hazlitt; this page labels the chapter XXXVIII. Its relevance is limited: physical withdrawal and one's relation to what is left are not one event. Historical rhetoric about vice, fetters and disease remains the text's rhetoric rather than a diagnosis of someone leaving a community. The essay transplants neither Montaigne's entire ideal of retirement nor a requirement to await inward clarity before leaving. It permits examination of two subjects without making the unresolved one a reason to suspend an available decision.

Sergei may stop attending and still return in thought to an argument held there. That does not undo the change. A continuing question does not make his decision false or require returning to complete the past correctly. Familiar words may remain in memory; someone may want to check an earlier argument. This essay establishes no cause for such return and supplies no health assessment. It permits a particular subject to be named: which claim needs understanding, which meeting will not continue, which conversation is presently unwanted. Distinguishing them demands no immediate removal of every reminder, and no single remembered phrase needs to represent the whole period.

The image of solitude is useful here as a question about one's attention, rather than an instruction to disappear from every relationship. Sergei can retain ordinary contact, necessary assistance and participation elsewhere. He need not live alone for the decision to be his. If quiet or distance is wanted, its subject can be named without universally opposing society to freedom. Leaving one form of belonging differs from rejecting people altogether. This also marks the limit of our application of Montaigne: the contemporary invented scene asks about a change's scale rather than making every historical recommendation compulsory for a present reader. The source remains an interlocutor rather than a complete plan.

IV. Gratitude has a subject

At the beginning of Meditations, Marcus names what he learned from relatives and teachers. The selected local sections I–IV in the Casaubon edition supply personal recollection of different qualities, not complete biographies. They permit a question about what someone values in experience received. Sergei may remember who first helped him read a difficult passage attentively. Such gratitude has a subject and certifies none of that person's other views. Gratitude is also no compulsory outcome of leaving. If it is absent, or someone does not wish to express it now, this essay identifies no deficiency and requires no invented positive meaning. The distinction makes room for genuine appreciation rather than a prescribed emotion.

Retaining particular knowledge likewise does not mean agreeing with every earlier interpretation. Sergei may use a language learned, remember a way of reading, and understand the text differently now. He can identify a skill's origin without declaring that experience the only possible source of his development. A modest account may say that he first encountered a question there; what would otherwise have happened is unknown. This precision need not lessen the meeting's significance. It prevents gratitude from becoming a general dependence on those who helped, and learning from becoming a commitment never to reconsider one's understanding. Provenance can remain visible while judgement continues to belong to the learner.

If Sergei objects to something from an earlier meeting, gratitude need not erase the known objection. Help with one book can be acknowledged without justifying a different action. Yet one questioned action does not automatically disclose everything about every participant or meeting. Considering specific subjects avoids both blanket justification and blanket accusation. It requires no balanced distribution of praise and criticism merely to appear fair. Each fact can be considered on its own grounds. A decision to stop attending may remain clear even where evaluation of the past is mixed and someone does not intend to colour every event alike. No overall verdict is necessary for a particular present boundary.

V. John: a narrative of faith is no scheme for leaving

In John9:34–38, being cast out does not end the person's encounter or question about faith. The selected KJV passage ends with address to Jesus and worship. This is a Christian text with a particular object of faith, not a neutral story of independence from every community. Expulsion in the narrative also differs from Sergei's voluntary decision. The comparison is limited to outward position and a continuing religious question. It establishes neither that every departure confirms the leaver's correctness, that every community errs, nor that changed belonging necessarily brings the same answer. A contemporary community's details cannot be reconstructed from these verses, and the difference between the two situations remains explicit.

Keeping the source's religious ground matters even for a reader who does not share it. The question's addressee can be understood precisely without making the text confirmation of one's own position. If Sergei continues investigating faith, his question needs its own content. If he no longer chooses a religious answer, that does not permit rewriting the Gospel scene as rejection of faith. Respect for difference works in both directions: the source retains its grounds, and a present person need not repeat its answer. The comparison clarifies a question's scale but replaces no judgement about the truth of claims. It supports accurate reading without requiring agreement to make reading worthwhile.

Sergei may retain a question the earlier participation no longer answers. Continuing it requires neither immediate choice of another community nor declaration of permanent solitude. A particular text might be read in another edition, a conversation held outside the earlier circle, or nothing undertaken for now. These are different possibilities, not stages of a required transition. No general sequence demands that every departure end in a new conviction. An answer not yet found does not cancel the choice to stop participating; an answer found does not prove every past question was handled incorrectly. Present uncertainty and a clear decision about meetings can therefore coexist without being made contradictory.

VI. Memory is not an agreement

After leaving, a familiar expression may still sound persuasive or become irritating. Sergei may notice that he uses an accustomed explanation while no longer accepting its ground. If wanted, that prompts clarification of a particular claim, rather than proving concealed membership or inability to leave. Remembering a language concludes no new agreement. Nor must every familiar word be removed to present a life as independent. A word's meaning concerns its current use and selected subject. An earlier expression may remain with a precise qualification, receive another explanation, or become unnecessary without a final public refutation. A changed vocabulary is one possible decision rather than the sole evidence of departure.

This distinction matters especially for practices. Sergei may continue voluntary attentive reading without calling it an established rite if its content or conditions change. He may retain prayer and relate it differently to community, or stop without explaining the decision to every acquaintance. Particular forms have particular grounds needing separate understanding. The essay claims neither that every alteration preserves a tradition nor that every personal question belongs to a community forever. An honest name for a present action retains both provenance and difference. Experience then need not be appropriated wholesale or declared entirely foreign merely because belonging has changed. The question concerns what the person currently does and means.

Retaining a habit does not necessarily show its value; stopping does not prove harm. If Sergei wants to consider an action, he needs a particular question: what it means now, whether it fits known conditions, and whether he wants to continue it. This essay provides no measure of every spiritual practice. Duration or familiarity alone cannot certify maturity. Yet every continuity cannot be made evidence that freedom is absent either. Personal judgement can retain, change or leave a question open. None must become a demonstration of the correct distance from former belonging. A present decision can be modest and specific rather than a comprehensive announcement about every practice previously encountered.

VII. Relationships need separate decisions

The acquaintance in our scene suggests meeting Sergei outside the reading evening. He may or may not want that conversation. Her invitation does not automatically request a return to the old discussion; his assent does not mean renewed membership. An unclear condition can be clarified: is this a personal meeting or continuation of a particular practice? Both people need room to decline. Retaining experience does not mean retaining every tie, and the other person chooses participation too. Friendship need not become payment for leaving correctly or a reward for unchanging assent. Our subject is this particular meeting, rather than a general account of how group relationships function.

Sometimes an interlocutor wants reasons for leaving, while someone wants to report only the fact. A request for explanation can be distinguished from a demand for a complete account. Sergei can choose how much to disclose; his acquaintance can disagree with an argument he does offer. Disagreement does not invalidate notice about current participation. The conversation need not end with one shared interpretation of the past. A particular invitation or refusal can be understood without that. Attention to these limits guarantees no calm response, but helps someone avoid promising what they do not choose. The sources establish no assurance that every relationship can or should be retained.

There are circumstances in which contact cannot continue or is no longer wanted; no final meeting is required for closure. Necessary support and a decision about distance have practical conditions of their own, replaced by no philosophical record. Where calm discussion is available, every acquaintance need not receive the same accusation, and persuading each person need not become one's obligation. Sergei may decline substantive discussion while reporting what is needed about a particular arrangement. This is no universal communication instruction. It is a limited possibility of choosing a conversation's subject while retaining different responses for both people, including the choice not to continue the exchange.

VIII. Gratitude does not erase disagreement

A personal transition is sometimes made coherent through one overall account: everything was a mistake, or everything was a necessary stage. Both explanations may be convenient, but neither follows automatically from the scene's facts. Sergei does not know what his path without the meetings would have been. He knows particular books, conversations and his present decision. They can be named more precisely without supposing every event was necessary in advance. Retaining experience here means allowing what is known its significance without justifying what is no longer accepted. If an overall meaning is absent, it need not be invented to make a biography attractive. The past can remain particular rather than total.

Disagreement has a scale too. An objection may concern a claim, a way of discussing, or one's earlier response. These subjects differ and each needs grounds of its own. Sergei may recognise that he accepted an interpretation too quickly; this does not establish lifelong inability to judge independently. An earlier error can be acknowledged without naming an entire life by it. Uncertainty about an evaluation can remain without cancelling the attendance decision. This approach requires neither forgiveness, condemnation nor public confession of the past. It leaves room to examine a particular assertion without producing another overall verdict on oneself or demanding that every earlier choice receive the same assessment.

If Sergei tells someone about the past, fact, interpretation and uncertainty can be separated. He first encountered a text at those evenings, considers himself to understand it differently now, and does not know every cause of an earlier change in outlook. Such an account can be sufficient for that selected subject. It makes no personal experience proof of how everyone else should develop. Another participant may retain belonging or evaluate the same discussion differently. Different accounts call for attention to the claims involved, rather than compulsory recognition that one person is spiritually more developed. A disagreement can remain real without turning into a ranking of entire lives.

IX. New participation need not repeat the earlier form

After leaving, someone may want another place to fill the earlier timetable immediately. Sergei can choose new meetings without treating them as replacements for every relationship and question. If participation is wanted, the particular form needs understanding: what is discussed, what participation is expected, and what he actually accepts. This essay proposes no checklist for assessing communities' structures. It stays with the personal scale of choosing one's presence. Difference from an earlier setting does not itself establish suitability; similarity does not make the future story identical either. Known conditions need to be understood anew rather than supplied by either enthusiasm for difference or fear of resemblance.

Choosing no new belonging for a time is possible too. It need not become a programme of complete independence or a promise never to join a community again. Sergei can name today's position without announcing an entire future life. No new label is needed to validate the earlier decision. If reading or conversation continues, those actions have subjects of their own; they need not immediately form a completed system. Openness does not imply that all convictions are equal or that questions of truth are unnecessary, however. A question remains a question, while participation remains a possible separate choice that need not precede every encounter with a text.

A later decision can also be reconsidered. If a new form does not fit, that does not necessarily make leaving a mistake or require proving loyalty to the new choice at any cost. A decision has known grounds at a particular time; further information may require another answer. This

permits no knowingly unfulfillable promise. A change affecting a particular agreement needs separate consideration. Consistency nevertheless differs from keeping every decision unchanged. A personal path can retain its history and change without requiring proof that each subsequent event settled the preceding one completely. A present revision can therefore be described without rewriting every earlier step.

X. Experience can remain varied

Returning to the scene, we need not decide the book's or friendship's future for Sergei. The significant change is that these questions have separated from an overall demand to be faithful to the past or free of every trace. He may keep the book, stop attending and answer only the acquaintance's particular suggestion. He may choose differently. Retaining experience is no obligation to hold everything. It is a possibility of preserving known distinctions instead of erasing them for one final assessment. Participation, understanding and relationships need not change together. That does not make every decision unclear: today's particular refusal can be precise within an unfinished understanding of the whole history.

The selected sources give different grounds for conversation. Montaigne asks about solitude and what someone carries; Marcus records learning received; John retains a Christian account of encounter and faith. They cannot be combined into one method for leaving or one teaching about independence. The editorial scene compares limited questions only. Historical recommendations and religious claims need their own context. This distinction lets the sources remain interlocutors rather than voices approving every present choice in advance. Sergei's decision needs no invented unanimous support from the three texts. Their differences can remain visible while his own question continues to have a particular contemporary subject.

Belonging can change while retaining a varied account. Understanding, rejection, gratitude, its absence and uncertainty may coexist where they actually fit someone's experience. Nothing needs to be added for an attractive ending. No deadline requires the past to become a clearly necessary stage or a final mistake. Today's participation can nevertheless be named precisely enough. Experience remains part of a history without governing every later decision, and departure retains its own scale. It requires neither destruction of every trace nor acknowledgement that an earlier interpretation alone is permissible. A person can continue a question, stop it, or choose another without a completed story becoming the price of that choice.

What this means in practice

If you wish, choose one ordinary subject of the present change: a meeting, a book or a proposed conversation. No difficult history, judgement of an entire community or final biography is required. Name what changes now and what does not yet follow. Declining regular meetings, for example, does not decide about every friendship. If the subject is too difficult or unwanted, the exercise may be skipped without another exercise taking its place.

Separately record a known fact of the past, your current understanding, and what remains unknown. No gratitude needs to be found where it is absent, and everything need not become a necessary stage. If particular help matters, its precise subject can be retained without justifying something else. A known refusal or objection need not be erased for a coherent story. The record is intended neither to prove another's wrongness nor to certify spiritual maturity.

If wanted, clarify today's participation or a decision not to continue a conversation. Notice concerning an arrangement requires no complete disclosure of inward experience; necessary support and practical conditions of distance retain their own significance. Future belonging can remain undecided. This is a voluntary editorial exercise in philosophical attention, not diagnosis or a proven way to complete a transition. Its efficacy is unestablished. Keep the record private or retain no record: clarity about one question need not become a compulsory public explanation of an entire life.

Key quotation

> *“Who is he, Lord, that I might believe on him?”*

— John9:36, the participant’s question to Jesus. King James Version.

Connections between traditions

Question	Textual bases and locators	Mechanism, difference and specific limit
Outward change and a continuing question	Montaigne, Of Solitude, local XXXVIII,3221–3319: withdrawal is considered alongside what a person carries; John9:34–38: encounter and the faith question continue after expulsion.	Montaigne considers solitude; the Gospel retains faith in Jesus. Comparison distinguishes a position from a question. It establishes no common mechanism for leaving, equates no voluntary decision with expulsion, and requires no inward question to be settled before departure.
Gratitude and an entire past	Marcus, bookI local CasaubonI–IV: different qualities are named as subjects of learning received; Montaigne XXXVIII,3236–3303: outward occupation and one's relation to oneself differ.	Personal gratitude and reflection on solitude have different purposes. This essay applies them to retained experience: particular help can be distinguished from an overall past assessment. This justifies no earlier action, requires no gratitude and supplies no complete account of people's biographies.
Different grounds for continuing	John9:35–38: the encounter has a particular religious addressee and ends in worship; Marcus, local I–IV: the author recalls qualities and instruction received.	A Christian answer concerning faith and Stoic recollection provide no single ground of belonging. They help distinguish conviction from a skill's origin. Retained knowledge certifies no earlier interpretation, while changed participation establishes no rejection of every religious question.
Solitude and relationships	Montaigne XXXVIII,3295–3303: inward solitude and reliance on oneself are considered alongside outward goods; Marcus, local I–IV: personal learning arises among relatives and teachers.	An historical ideal of solitude differs from gratitude to people. Applied to Sergei, this distinguishes distance from meetings from ending every friendship. It requires no contact to be retained and cancels no particular condition of necessary support or refusal to communicate.

Question	Textual bases and locators	Mechanism, difference and specific limit
Memory and present action	Montaigne XXXVIII,3275–3303: what remains with a person leads to the question of solitude; John9:34–38: changed position is not the selected scene's final event.	A continuing relation and a sequence within religious narrative are compared, not diagnosis and a contemporary procedure. The invented scene distinguishes remembered language from present participation. It establishes no concealed membership, compulsory new answer or permission to change every practice's form without altering content.
The limit of present application	Marcus, local I–IV: the record reports particular learning; John9:34–38: claims about faith belong to Christian narrative; Montaigne XXXVIII,3221–3319: solitude retains historical rhetoric.	The sources form no method for leaving. This essay asks its own question about a decision's scale and varied experience, retaining each text's grounds. It offers neither assessment of contemporary community structures, causal study of transition nor unanimous approval of every choice Sergei makes.

Primary sources

1. Montaigne, Of Solitude, chapterXXXVIII in this edition's numbering. Charles Cotton translation, William Carew Hazlitt editor,1877. The complete selected opening3221–3319 was read, with continuation3320–3369 for context; translation and edition information were read separately. Historical metaphors supply no medical explanation of a personal transition.

2. Marcus Aurelius, Meditations bookI, local I–IV. Edited Casaubon translation. Actual complete reading of these selected sections during P17 preparation and of the1634/1635 provenance note is retained; numbering identifies this page. Complete biographies were not verified.

3. John9:34–38, KJV. The entire selected passage and edition identification were read. Expulsion in religious narrative is not equated with voluntary departure from a contemporary community; its Christian ground remains explicit.

English quotations were checked against the named translations; Russian quotations are United Wisdom's own translations from those English editions. Sergei and the contemporary situation are invented. Comparison concerns personal biography, assesses no group structure and establishes no efficacy for the voluntary exercise.

Tags

community, belonging, leaving, experience, memory, choice, path, faith, tradition, agency, participation, conviction, gratitude, disagreement, friendship, relationships, reading, book, practice, question, decision, uncertainty, boundary, continuity, solitude, Montaigne, Marcus Aurelius, John, history, attention

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.