

UNITED WISDOM

Midlife: Reconsidering What Has Accumulated and What Remains Possible

Meaning and Direction

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

P24 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Midlife: Reconsidering What Has Accumulated and What Remains Possible

Epigraph

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

— Michel de Montaigne, Essays III.2, Of Repentance, opening section, paragraph on inquiry and doubt. Charles Cotton's translation, edited by William Carew Hazlitt, 1877.

What this article is about

At some point, earlier achievements may no longer fully answer how one wants to live next. This need not mean a mistaken biography, a compulsory crisis at a certain age, or a need to destroy everything. Midlife here names a situation of reconsideration: someone notices accumulated experience, existing commitments, and desires still seeking a place. Montaigne, Aristotle, and Ecclesiastes help distinguish a changing person, the active use of what has been acquired, and different relations to keeping and relinquishing. Their foundations remain distinct. We infer no universal age pattern and offer no medical or financial guidance. An invented adult editor's story shows how a general question about a new life can become more definite without depreciating the past or promising a second ideal beginning. Reconsideration may lead to change, continuity, or postponement. What matters is the accuracy with which values, possibilities, consequences, and affected people are considered, rather than the outcome's drama.

I. An Achievement Can Remain Valuable without Remaining Sufficient

Imagine Roman, an editor aged forty-six. He can organize a department, colleagues value him, and his income is stable. Yet coordination occupies most of the week, while he keeps postponing a piece of his own. One evening he notices that he speaks about work only through responsibility and results, scarcely recalling what he wanted to do himself. This is an invented story, not a typical portrait of an age. It does not make management meaningless. Roman genuinely values much of what he has achieved. His question is different: must what has accumulated determine the whole next part of life, or can he consider more carefully an undertaking that previously found no time?

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Insufficiency does not always mean falsity. The work may have suited earlier conditions and still contain important relationships and skills. At the same time, the current schedule may leave no place for another desired undertaking. Those statements coexist in our scene. Declare the whole past mistaken, and writing must prove that previous years were unnecessary. Declare the past uniquely correct, and the new wish cannot be discussed without a charge of ingratitude. Between those extremes lies a definite lack: Roman has no time for an authored piece. That is not yet a decision, but it is a subject distinct from passing sentence on a profession and an entire biography.

Sometimes the question arises from fatigue, sometimes changed interests, sometimes external circumstances. These possibilities need not be collapsed into one age-based explanation. Roman can first notice where dissatisfaction has a definite subject. Is it strongest after a week without rest, or specifically when he gives up his own writing? An invented scene cannot establish the cause of a real person’s condition. It shows that different causes would require different answers. Rest, a changed work format, and reconsideration of a professional aim are not interchangeable means. There is no need to declare a new life necessary before identifying what requires attention now and which information remains missing.

II. Reconsideration Begins with Distinctions, Not a Final Score

What has accumulated can be considered in several respects: abilities, resources, promised participation, habits, and values. This is a scheme proposed for the essay, not a universal test. Roman can edit and organize people, earns income, carries part of a shared budget, and habitually accepts every urgent discussion. These subjects are connected but different. Revising a habit need not mean abandoning an ability, and preserving income need not require every work action to remain identical. Until distinctions are made, any change looks either wholly rescuing or wholly threatening. Different elements of a biography have been mentally assembled into one indivisible object.

A list need not be wholly positive. Name a mistake, a missed opportunity, or a continuing conflict without turning the exercise into self-punishment. In our scene Roman acknowledges that he sometimes called a discussion necessary when he was simply afraid to decline. This is a possible assessment of his action, not a diagnosis or an explanation of all managers. It does not make his earlier work meaningless. Nor must it be immediately justified by insisting that everything was necessary. A habit obstructing a chosen undertaking can be examined as a habit. An accurate list can contain both a real achievement and a definite shortcoming, without erasing either for an emotionally convenient story about the other.

The list cannot settle what remains possible either. Experience may open some paths but does not automatically report their conditions. Roman knows how to work with text, yet a book of his own is not thereby guaranteed to be written or received by readers. He needs time, an idea,

and work; some circumstances remain beyond his decisions. Reconsideration does not derive proof of a successful future from accumulated past achievements. It helps identify actual resources and places requiring further knowledge. The list might reveal a nearer task smaller than the desired image: recovering one working evening, rather than immediately constructing a new profession and a new source of income.

III. A Changing Person Need Not Pretend to Be Finished

In the opening paragraphs of Montaigne's Essays III.2, Of Repentance, Charles Cotton's translation edited by William Carew Hazlitt in 1877, the subject of self-description changes over time. The author distinguishes relating himself from delivering a finished teaching while retaining moral assessment. This is no programme of compulsory midlife renewal. Our use is limited: an earlier self-description need not exhaust present consideration.

Roman has described himself chiefly as a manager for years. That was no lie; it reflected real work. Now he wants his description to leave room for a text of his own. He need not establish that the new version is true and the old one a mask. Both concern one person under different circumstances and with different tasks. This is a contemporary application, not Montaigne's statement about occupational change. It avoids demanding a single immutable formula for a biography. Explain what changed in interest or time allocation while respecting earlier participation. Revised self-description matters when it names action more accurately, rather than merely replacing an uncomfortable past with an attractive image.

Changeability does not justify every inconsistency. A promise does not automatically become unmade when desires change. Roman should tell colleagues about an intended work adjustment and examine existing arrangements. He need not preserve an old schedule forever, but owes accuracy to those who relied on it. Relating a changing self must not become a way to erase other people's expectations retrospectively. Some expectations may arise merely from others' habits; others from an actual promise. Examine the particular relationships to distinguish them. Neither age nor a new self-image can answer on someone's behalf for the consequences of the action they choose.

IV. Having What Was Acquired and Using It Are Different Relations

In Nicomachean Ethics, book I, chapters V–VI as numbered in D. P. Chase's translation, Aristotle considers active exercise as distinct from possessing a state. Chapter VI also recognizes external conditions. We do not transfer his hierarchical exclusions concerning human flourishing into contemporary assessments of people. The adopted question is limited: what does something accumulated enable a person to do, rather than simply have?

Roman’s experience could serve different actions: managing a department, helping a junior editor, or working on his own piece. Do not declare them equally suitable in advance; examine their actual content. An old ability may require further learning before transfer. It also does not disappear when someone changes their form of participation. Reconsideration may seek another use for accumulated experience rather than its wholesale rejection. Roman might reduce coordination while preserving some editorial work. This hypothetical possibility still needs examination with colleagues. It shows that a choice may concern the distribution of activity within a profession, rather than only the opposition between remaining unchanged and becoming somebody completely different.

Distinguishing possession from action does not make rest a moral deficiency. An ancient passage should not become a demand to prove usefulness continuously. Roman’s unwritten piece may relate not only to interests but to a shortage of available working time. Workload and necessary conditions then need examination before another undertaking is assigned for the sake of correct activity. This essay establishes no medical explanation for fatigue. It retains a simple limit: action depends on conditions, and acquired skill does not remove that dependence. Sometimes preserving resources carefully permits important work to continue; sometimes the understanding of work itself needs reconsideration. One word about age cannot determine which possibility applies.

V. Keeping and Relinquishing Need Not Be Opposing Virtues

In Ecclesiastes 3:1–15, King James Version, keeping and relinquishing appear among different times; the passage then concerns labour, God’s gift, and limited human understanding. This is a religious horizon, not a promise of independently choosing the ideal time for every change. Images of killing or hatred become no contemporary prescriptions here. Our limited comparison concerns different relations to what has accumulated.

Roman may preserve experience, relationships with colleagues, and definite commitments while relinquishing the habit of joining every coordination meeting. Keeping one thing does not require keeping everything. Relinquishing one thing does not prove the rest meaningless. This is our practical distinction, not a conclusion that the ancient passage authorizes every departure on personal desire alone. A decision needs a subject: what is being kept, what someone wants to relinquish, and which transition is required. Sometimes continuity is an active choice rather than fear of change. Sometimes relinquishment is responsible completion rather than disregard. Neither can be identified merely from the outward fact that someone stayed in an old position or left it.

Midlife does not automatically announce that it is time to relinquish a particular undertaking. Someone may feel urgency without knowing which part needs changing. Roman initially thinks he must leave the editorial office, then recognizes another possible arrangement. This does

not guarantee that smaller changes are always better. Elsewhere, the existing arrangement may genuinely be unacceptable. The essay chooses no outcome in advance. It distinguishes the image of a life season from a ready instruction about work or relationships. An image can help pose a question, but conditions and consequences are needed for an answer. The source retains its own religious meaning without requiring readers to adopt a faith in order to reconsider their biographies.

VI. Past Investment Is Not the Sole Argument about the Future

Years devoted to an undertaking can make departure from its old form feel like betrayal of time itself. Yet those years have been lived; the next choice concerns what action will mean now. This is an editorial distinction, not economic advice. Roman has genuinely acquired experience he values. He can recognize it without requiring every earlier element of work to continue. Which ground besides past investment supports the present arrangement: the undertaking’s value, existing commitments, income, interest, or lack of a suitable alternative? Each ground has content. The number of years lived must not answer for them all or prohibit every clarification of the future.

Accumulation may also create real consequences for relinquishment. Someone is responsible for completing a task, others have justified expectations, and transition takes time. Those matters cannot all be labelled traps of the past. Roman’s department is accustomed to his participation, but some arrangements were genuinely undertaken by him. Distinguish others’ habits from promised actions, then discuss what to complete, what to transfer, and suitable timing. This is no compulsory departure procedure for every occupation; actual conditions require examination. The distinction matters: past investment does not settle decisions forever, while responsibility created through action may continue. Personal reconsideration does not mean others must immediately bear every cost of the chosen change.

Roman may regret the writing he postponed. There is no need to prove that delay brought hidden benefits or that current work will redeem everything. Some desired work may truly remain undone. Name that without asserting a whole life wasted. His next piece need not be great enough to justify earlier years. Its meaning may be smaller: pursuing something important at an available scale. If it fails, all editorial participation is not annulled. If it succeeds, every earlier difficulty does not become a necessary step toward success. This permits an imperfect past and an uncertain future without requiring them to be joined into one impeccable story.

VII. A Possibility Needs a Scale and Conditions

The words still possible may name a desire, a conjecture, or an examined path. These are different subjects. Roman wants to write more; that is a desire. He supposes he can make time; that needs examination. A work arrangement discussed with colleagues and family would become a more definite possibility, although the writing's outcome remains unknown. This distinction does not extinguish hope. It identifies what already has grounds and where another action is needed. Begin with one project in our scene rather than promising a whole new life. An undertaking's scale should fit available conditions, rather than an obligation immediately to compensate for all the years of postponement.

Small scale guarantees no harmlessness. One evening can change care arrangements, and a modest project can demand significant energy. Name consequences instead of assuming a small step costs nothing. Roman discusses who will handle a household task during that time and whether work can change without a concealed burden on a junior colleague. Those questions do not automatically make writing selfish. They show that a personal undertaking exists within relationships. Conditions may permit it or require another scale or date. Discussion should concern the actual action, rather than obtaining blanket permission from everyone nearby to have an interest of one's own.

Examination may reveal that the current possibility is too narrow for the desired result. That need mean neither a final rejection nor an invitation to try still harder. Seek another form, postpone deciding, or acknowledge that this particular undertaking is currently unavailable. The essay promises no compulsory alternative route. Roman may write a short piece instead of a large book if it matters to him, without calling the substitute equivalent. Regret about another scale remains permissible. An accurate decision can include both a chosen action and an acknowledged limitation. It need not conceal the cost to support an attractive claim that reconsidering life opens everything someone truly desires.

VIII. Change Affects Relationships without Requiring a General Tribunal

When Roman tells someone close that he wants to write, they may hear a threat to the whole previous order. Identify what he actually proposes changing and what remains a question. Reserving an evening differs from leaving a job or moving elsewhere. Do not announce them as one indivisible dream if no decision has been made. Precision promises no eternal preservation of everything else. It allows discussion of the current subject without asking the listener to accept every possible future immediately. The close person can ask about time and the budget. Answering need not become a report proving Roman's moral entitlement to dissatisfaction with his current work arrangement.

Nor should every objection be labelled fear of another person’s freedom. The other person may have tasks and limitations of their own. A partner in our scene cannot support the chosen evening because they already have a commitment then. That is a substantive objection to time allocation, not proof that a new wish is prohibited. Seek another arrangement while retaining the significance of both undertakings. Sometimes no conveniently shared solution exists. A real conflict then remains and does not disappear through a correct interpretation of midlife. This essay provides no method guaranteeing agreement among all interests. It distinguishes interests, actions, and personal assessment so disagreement on one subject need not immediately indict an entire biography or relationship.

Not every acquaintance needs that detailed conversation. Roman can mention one project without discussing the family budget and every doubt. Disclosure depends on the relationship and the decision’s effects on another person. This is neither a demand for secrecy nor a requirement to proclaim independence publicly. A colleague taking on tasks needs definite information; a casual interlocutor may not. Some consideration can remain unfinished and private. A public image of confident renewal need not precede an actual decision. Sometimes the ability to clarify an undertaking quietly matters more than immediately announcing a new life chapter and then feeling obliged to fulfil every attractive phrase before those who heard the first announcement.

IX. A Trial Need Not Immediately Become a New Identity

Roman can try writing one piece during the agreed time. The trial has a subject: whether the work arrangement suits him and which task was accomplished. It should not simultaneously prove talent, the change’s correctness, and the meaning of every earlier year. Load one result with those proofs and its actual content becomes harder to see. An unfinished piece could show that the idea needs clarification or that time was insufficient. That informs another decision rather than supplying a general verdict. The trial may also produce no useful answer immediately. Every action does not necessarily lead to clarity merely because someone began renewing life courageously.

Returning to the earlier arrangement is possible too. If Roman decides management matters more to him now, that need not mean defeat through fear. His assessment of the task or circumstances may change. Do not predetermine that conclusion to protect routine, or prohibit it for an attractive story of a new life. A trial permits reconsideration in both directions. It need not end in a permanent identity as a book’s author. Sometimes the useful result clarifies what someone wants to preserve and why. That may be smaller than expected without necessarily being less independent. Choosing includes considered continuity when it has genuinely been examined rather than declared the only permissible outcome.

A trial itself has limits. An action with irreversible consequences for others does not become an experiment merely because someone is unsure of the desire. A small piece of writing differs from suddenly leaving without transferring an accepted task. Saying I will try does not remove consequences. A significant decision needs corresponding information and discussion of affected conditions; this essay prescribes no legal or financial procedure. Distinguishing scale prevents transferring one action’s ease to another. Reconsideration may be gradual, but gradualness alone proves no safety. What matters is the actual action, possible consequences, and remaining responsibility, rather than a convenient name someone wishes to give the chosen change.

X. Reconsidering Life Does Not Mean Beginning without a Past

A new decision never begins completely empty. Roman brings experience, relationships, habits, and limitations to writing. Some help; others require change. There is no need to promise a self unhindered by everything earlier. That image might make an actual trial seem insufficiently pure before it begins. Writing’s value does not depend on erasing a managerial past. Roman can use editorial attention while learning another distribution of time. Reconsideration then concerns relationships among parts of a biography, rather than seeking a life that first becomes genuine only after rejecting everything accumulated. The past remains material for consideration, requiring neither justification of every element nor complete repudiation.

Midlife in this consideration has no compulsory number or single task for everyone. The name indicates a felt relationship to what has been lived and what remains possible. One person may change jobs, another their participation in familiar work, a third preserve the arrangement while clarifying a question. These possibilities are not ranked by courage here. The chosen philosophical excerpts yield no medical norm, compulsory crisis calendar, or promise of successful transformation. Their usefulness is limited to distinctions permitting closer consideration of a decision. When a concern involves a prolonged difficult condition or health, philosophical reflection does not replace suitable assistance. That is a boundary of genre, not a diagnosis of someone reconsidering a biography.

Roman’s next action may be definite: discuss a working evening and choose one piece’s subject. That does not answer every question about the future. Yet he no longer has to choose between endless loyalty to every part of the old arrangement and complete cancellation of the past. Preserve what matters, clarify what changed, and acknowledge the unavailable without a general formula for a correct life. Elsewhere the action will differ or the decision remain open. Reconsideration matters when it names a subject, grounds, and consequences more accurately, rather than requiring an impressive new biography. Accumulation does not have to

become either a cage or an excuse. It can remain part of a life in which decisions are still made without a guarantee of their outcomes.

What this means in practice

Choose one area for reconsideration without declaring a whole life failed or finished. Record what retains value, what needs change, and what information remains missing. This is a voluntary exercise in consideration, not an established means of overcoming a midlife crisis. A question about what comes next does not require assigning yourself a crisis.

Name what has been acquired separately from a possible action. I can edit; I want to write a definite piece; I suppose I can reserve an evening. Ability, desire, and conjecture have different standing. Which conditions are verifiable? Who would be affected? What promise has already been accepted? These questions prevent a desired image becoming a ready possibility. Health, legal, or financial conditions require suitable current information, rather than an inference from a philosophical excerpt.

Consider a small action if it actually fits the undertaking and its consequences are acceptable. Smallness proves no harmlessness. In our scene discussion of working time precedes a promise to write a book. Gathering information, reducing workload, or leaving the decision open may come first. Postponement needs a stated subject rather than silently becoming a general ban on new interests.

After acting, examine the subject for which the action was chosen: whether time became available, whether the arrangement suits, and what was learned about the task. One trial need not answer finally who you are. Preserve important parts of an earlier order, change a definite part, and acknowledge regret about what is unavailable. The result need not look like an entirely new life to be an accurate decision under present conditions.

Key quotation

> *A time to get, and a time to lose; a time to keep, and a time to cast away;*

— Ecclesiastes 3:6, King James Version. The verse remains within the religious horizon of 3:1–15, not a ready authorization for every relinquishment.

Connections between traditions

1. **Changing description and active life.** Montaigne III.2's opening paragraphs consider a changing subject over time; Aristotle I, chapter V in Chase's numbering, distinguishes active exercise from merely having a capacity. The shared question asks why an earlier description does not exhaust present action. This permits reconsidering editorial experience's use without requiring a biography's destruction. The boundary: Montaigne's self-description is not Aristotle's theory of human function; Aristotle's normative virtue is not any interest an author happens to have. Comparison provides no compulsory age method.

2. **Continuity and differing times.** Montaigne III.2's paragraph about movement from day to day does not fix a person in one state; Ecclesiastes 3:6 and 3:10–14 places keeping and relinquishing within time and God's action. The comparative mechanism distinguishes continuity from immutability. Keeping what matters need not mean keeping everything. The boundary: changing self-observation is not the religious order of times, and the verse promises no personal power to select the ideal moment for every change. Similarity cancels no responsibility for a particular completion.

3. **Accumulation and its use.** Aristotle I, chapter VI in Chase's numbering, distinguishes possessing a state from active exercise; Ecclesiastes 3:9–13 questions labour and calls enjoyment of its good God's gift. The common question concerns a meaningful relation to what has been acquired. A stock of experience does not replace examination of its present use. The boundary: Aristotle's virtuous activity and a religious understanding of gift form no single theory of flourishing. Neither passage proves that more work necessarily improves life or that rest lacks value.

4. **Limitations and conditions of action.** Aristotle I, chapter VI in Chase's numbering, recognizes external conditions; Ecclesiastes 3:11 limits human understanding of God's work. Their shared thematic significance resists making desire sufficient grounds for a guaranteed future. Examine project resources while leaving the unknown unknown. The boundary: insufficient means for activity differ from a religious limit to knowledge. Aristotle's historical exclusions concerning birth, appearance, and family status become no contemporary assessment of dignity; the verse becomes no prohibition on planning.

5. **Consideration without a final legend.** Montaigne III.2's paragraph on inquiry and doubt distinguishes relating from a finished teaching; Ecclesiastes 3:11–14 retains limited understanding and the religious significance of present labour. The shared question asks whether action needs an exhaustive explanation of a biography. Here, the next piece need not justify every earlier year. The boundary: essayistic doubt is not reverence for God, and religious completeness becomes no promise of successful change. Our inference concerns a precise next decision, rather than a general right to cancel earlier commitments.

Primary sources

Russian quotations are United Wisdom's own translations from the identified English translations, without collation against French, Greek, or Hebrew originals. English quotations retain the verified translations' words. Actual scopes, semantic limits, and rights are recorded in sources.json and research_notes.md; complete works are not claimed as read. Comparison is no general theory of age.

• Michel de Montaigne. Essays III.2, Of Repentance. Charles Cotton; edited by William Carew Hazlitt, 1877. The opening section from a changing subject to the paragraph on inquiry and doubt, plus immediate moral-assessment context, was read. The epigraph is that paragraph's complete concluding sentence.

• Aristotle. The Nicomachean Ethics. D. P. Chase; Project Gutenberg no.8438. Book I, chapters V–VI in this translation's numbering: active exercise, state and use, and external conditions. Other editions may number chapters differently; the underlying print edition's date was not established from the viewed heading. No direct quotation. The historical text's hierarchical exclusions are not adopted as contemporary assessments of people.

• Ecclesiastes 3:1–15. King James Version. All 15 verses were read; only 3:6 is quoted, 19 English words. The religious boundaries of 3:10–14 remain; individual images become no practical prescriptions.

The historical texts and translations have the stated US public-domain grounds, not a claim of unrestricted worldwide rights. The site separately labels KJV Public Domain; no different territorial status is inferred from that label. This packet authorizes neither complete raw-source import nor vectorization.

Tags

midlife, life transitions, reconsideration, accumulation, possibilities, experience, activity, values, meaning, biography, change, continuity, relinquishment, regret, uncertainty, responsibility, commitments, relationships, work, profession, creativity, time, conditions, trial, Montaigne, Aristotle, Ecclesiastes, self-understanding, life decisions, reflective practice

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.