

UNITED WISDOM

Meaning after difficult experience without justifying what happened

Meaning and Direction

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

P32 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Meaning after difficult experience without justifying what happened

Epigraph

> *“things too wonderful for me, which I knew not.”*

— Job42:3, selected fragment, King James Version; editorial final period added to the fragment.

What this article is about

Can present actions acquire significance without calling an earlier difficult experience necessary or good? This essay distinguishes an event, its assessment, another person’s explanation, and changeable personal meaning. An invented scene involving Pavel, a lost sketchbook, and a friend’s assistance examines a particular conversation without a compulsory lesson or finished growth story. The selected ending of Job, Buddhist instruction about two arrows, and an episode in Plato’s Apology retain different religious and ethical grounds. They form no single method and establish no contemporary exercise’s efficacy. Gratitude for loss, immediate forgiveness, and public explanation are not required. The voluntary concluding exercise clarifies one subject of today’s conversation if a reader wishes to approach it. What remains unknown can remain unknown.

I. A later good does not rewrite an earlier event

Imagine Pavel learning that an acquaintance has discarded a sketchbook left with them, although they had agreed to keep his things until their next meeting. The scene is invented, not a researched case. Photographs of some drawings remain. A friend helps sort them, and their conversation suggests an interesting idea for another piece of work. The friend then says that perhaps everything is for the best: otherwise Pavel would never have started. This raises the essay’s question. The idea may genuinely matter to Pavel while discarding the sketchbook remains an unwanted action. Acknowledging one does not require changing the assessment of the other. The later conversation does not establish why the event occurred or whether it should have occurred at all.

Pavel can thank his friend for help with photographs, withhold thanks for the loss, and remain uncertain about his next activity. These responses concern different things. Joining them into one compulsory conclusion makes any attempt to continue appear to approve what happened. A person then seems entitled to a future only after agreeing with the past. That conclusion

needs grounds absent from our scene. Assistance followed the loss; this is a sequence of events. It does not establish that loss was a necessary condition of interest, a just teaching method, or a good Pavel has not yet learned to appreciate. The order of time can be retained without adding an invented purpose to another person’s action.

Meaning in this conversation can be understood concretely. It may be the significance of one action: keeping the remaining images, completing a drawing, naming the earlier pages’ importance, or declining a premature explanation. An overall answer about an entire life is unnecessary. Pavel may want to work while continuing to regret what was lost. The tension between these parts does not need immediate removal. They describe different aspects of his present relation to the event. This essay does not claim that making the distinction reduces pain or guarantees progress. It considers a person’s ability to choose words and actions without turning every later good into proof that an earlier event without their agreement was right.

II. Cause, assessment, and personal meaning ask different questions

A causal question asks what led to an event. An evaluative question concerns our assessment of a known action and its consequences. A personal conclusion concerns significance someone now gives to a part of experience. Answers may intersect without automatically replacing one another. The acquaintance discarded the sketchbook: the action is known within the scene, the motive unestablished. Pavel did not want the loss: this describes his response to it. He may decide to keep the remaining photographs more carefully: a possible present choice. That choice proves neither benevolent intention nor deserved loss. Precision means retaining each statement’s subject. Even a convincing story about learning does not supply causes its teller does not yet know.

Confusion readily develops around the word lesson. It can name acquired knowledge, a considered change in action, or an event’s supposed purpose. Learning something afterward does not establish that what happened was sent for teaching. Pavel may clarify a useful way to store images without portraying the destroyed sketchbook as a beneficial teaching aid. If his friend offers a conclusion, ownership of that conclusion matters. A sincere wish to support him does not establish meaning for Pavel. The friend can ask whether he wants to discuss possible conclusions and accept another subject of conversation. Support becomes more precise when it does not require an offered interpretation to be presented as truth the person has already found.

Distinguishing questions also leaves room for uncertainty. Pavel may know some circumstances and not others. Missing information does not require the most comforting

explanation, and an unfinished conclusion does not require ordinary activities to cease. Sometimes only a small response is available: those pages matter, that action was unwanted, and I now want to keep what remains. Modesty does not make the account defective. A person can decline to fill gaps with another's motives, universal laws of fate, or proof of their own maturity. New information may later change the causal question separately. The meaning of today's action need not become a final explanation of yesterday. These answers can remain distinct and change at different times.

III. Another explanation has no final authority

In Job42:1–8 Job's words about limited understanding and God's subsequent address to the friends have different speakers. In42:7–8 the friends are rebuked for what they said about God. This religious ending of a complex narrative is no contemporary support model and gives us no general answer to why a particular person suffers. Our narrow comparison concerns an explaining voice's limit: a friend's confident account is not made true by proximity to someone's difficult experience. Repentance, sacrifice, and agreement with the text's theology are not imposed on the reader. [1]

Pavel's friend can respond practically to that boundary: hear that the explanation has not been accepted and continue the offered assistance. They need not declare themselves a bad friend or abandon every view of their own. They simply need not treat those views as an already shared understanding. They can acknowledge having made a suggestion and ask what conversation is wanted now. If Pavel prefers discussing the photographs, that request has content of its own. The friend need not guess every feeling but can refrain from replacing an answer with another attempt at persuasion. Two participants remain: one can offer, the other can choose a subject. Supportive closeness requires no immediate identical account or common moral of the event.

Pavel may also offer an explanation he later revises. The right to personal meaning does not make every formulation expressed today final. He may first speak of a new drawing's value, later find the conversation more important, and eventually stop joining the events into one story. These changes need not retroactively cancel the sincerity of earlier words. Nor does a personal interpretation automatically explain someone else's experience. If Pavel tells another person a similar story, he can retain the distinction: this was its significance for me, while yours remains unknown to me. Such a limit keeps meaning personal rather than making one found phrase compulsory for everyone who has experienced loss or an unwanted action.

IV. Personal meaning grants no retrospective permission

Return to the arrangement about the sketchbook. Pavel’s later decision to draw differently does not change what he previously agreed with the acquaintance. Today’s choice belongs to today. Permission to store things and permission to destroy them are different actions; a new interest cannot make them identical. The scene does not determine legal responsibility: information needed for that decision was not gathered. It concerns precision in ordinary conversation. Pavel can say that he found an activity while also recalling the broken arrangement. A listener need not select just one sentence to acknowledge both. Continuing the day does not cancel the ability to call an earlier action unwanted or decline to justify it.

Comparison between people also has a limit. One person may say that a difficult experience changed their work, while another finds no similar significance in theirs. These accounts form no ladder of maturity. The first does not prove that the second is insufficiently committed; the second does not expose the first as self-deception. Personal words can be distinguished from a general demand. Pavel may enjoy a new idea, and his friend may hear that pleasure without immediately concluding that every loss is useful. If they later discuss another person’s event, that person’s participation remains a separate question. Similar circumstances transfer no authority to determine someone else’s assessment, pace, or compulsory moral.

The distinction keeps gratitude’s subject specific: a friend’s help, time spent talking, a recovered photograph, or one’s own work. These things can be named without thanking everything that happened at once. If Pavel does not want to discuss gratitude, that absence does not establish his moral condition either. The essay introduces no compulsory positive conclusion. What matters is choosing a statement a person can actually make now. Sometimes a description is sufficient: this image remains, that conversation occurred, the sketchbook is lost. Later significance can stand alongside those facts without rewriting them. No discovered sentence restores discarded pages or proves that losing them was desirable.

V. Two aspects of experience do not imply complete control of pain

SN36.6 uses two arrows to distinguish bodily painful feeling from an additional mental response, placing the distinction within a Buddhist path of liberation. The selected English translation is by Ṭhānissaro Bhikkhu, verified through the official translation index. We do not turn the instruction into a promise that all grief is voluntary or easily controlled. Its limited contribution here concerns an experienced event and an added interpretation. The friend’s statement that loss was necessary, for example, is a separate assertion rather than the loss itself. Its content can be considered without a duty to change feelings immediately. The source’s religious grounds remain distinct from our ordinary scene and contemporary editorial exercise. [2]

In the scene, missing drawings can be distinguished from several statements about them. The friend may discuss the idea, the acquaintance the reasons for their action, and Pavel his regret. Each speech has a speaker and subject. Clarifying them means hearing the claim rather than selecting whoever feels correctly. Declining another’s explanation guarantees no relief. Pavel may reject the formula that everything is for the best and still regret the pages. The absence of quick change does not make his response mistaken. Our reasoning concerns accurate statements and freedom of discussion, not measuring an experience’s intensity or rating someone’s capacity to cope.

The image itself has limits. Arrows in Buddhist instruction cannot silently become any contemporary story, and a source’s name cannot certify demonstrated efficacy. This essay has investigated no psychological outcomes of the exercise. A narrower conversational question is enough: which words were added to a known event, who proposed them, and does the person want to discuss them? An answer can be brief or absent. Sometimes practical assistance is wanted instead of an analysis of interpretations. That choice is not rated as unenlightenment or resistance to growth. Retaining the source’s context limits the comparison and avoids blaming someone because their experience has not taken a form convenient for another’s philosophical account.

VI. An account can remain private and unfinished

Pavel need not show the new drawing to everyone who heard about the sketchbook's loss. Work may remain private; its appearance does not establish readiness to explain the event publicly. Asked what the story now means, he can choose a small answer, another conversation, or silence. Not every action requires an accompanying overall account. Today's interest may be understandable while one's relation to the whole event remains uncertain. These states can coexist without a final name. The retained photographs provide material for a particular activity, not a duty to turn it into evidence of inward renewal. Work can be acknowledged at its actual scale: lines, a chosen sheet, time spent, and an open question.

Privacy differs from a ban on conversation. Pavel may later want to share the story and decide what to include: regret, interest, irritation, assistance, or only circumstances. That selection gives a listener no complete scheme of his life. An unfinished account need not be helped into a conclusion. One unclear fact can be clarified, or room left for another meeting. A note, post, or conversation is especially not a lifelong agreement to repeat one assessment. Words can change while retaining respect for an earlier account. The former story need not be declared an error, nor the new one proved the final truth about everything that occurred.

Revising meaning does not make all factual assertions equivalent. The sketchbook was discarded and photographs remain: these are the invented scene's stated facts. Further information should be considered as information rather than automatic confirmation of the most convenient conclusion. The new drawing's personal significance concerns another subject; it may change without changing the loss. Retaining separate levels is useful when a listener wants to help but does not know which response will be welcome. Instead of a large conclusion, they can ask about one activity or hear an existing request. Neither storyteller nor listener must discover a common final account before today's meeting ends. Another meeting may begin with another question.

VII. A valuable response does not make another action right

In Plato's Apology Socrates recounts refusing the Thirty's order to bring Leon. In Jowett's translation he says that he went home; the adjoining account mentions death as a risk had the regime not ended. This is Plato's character speaking about justice and duty, not an independently reconstructed historical report. We compare only the unwanted order with the value of a response to it. Refusal does not make the order a proper lesson. Religious and ethical grounds of the speech are retained. The episode establishes neither invulnerability, a general instruction to enter dangerous confrontations, nor a reader's duty to prove meaning through such an action. [3]

Pavel’s scene is much smaller, and equating it with a political episode serves no purpose. Only a narrow distinction is available: today’s choice need not justify what it answers. Pavel may begin a drawing, decline discussion of a lesson, or ask for help locating an image. Each activity’s significance can be considered through its own subject. These actions need not become a heroic biography or evidence of exceptional endurance. The friend can offer practical help without calling it rescue. A precise scale gives less reason to make a small activity answer for an entire life. Continuing does not always require an extraordinary deed, public position, or transferable exemplary story.

Assessment and personal action may have different timetables. Pavel may now be certain that the sketchbook should have been retained while not knowing whether to draw again. A later wish to work requires no new trial of all earlier words. If assessment changes, it needs its own grounds rather than merely a convenient outcome. New information about the arrangement, for example, would deserve a separate conversation. This order allows action without artificially finishing the past. The essay offers no universal assessment of difficult events: circumstances differ too much. It retains the narrower distinction between the value of a chosen response and the rightness of the event being answered.

VIII. Assistance has its own name and conditions

The friend may offer to check an old phone for photographs. This is specific assistance, requiring time and having an identifiable subject. Pavel can agree, decline, or suggest another activity. Agreeing to search for an image does not mean agreeing to discuss loss’s significance. If the friend returns to their explanation during the search, the meeting’s subject can be clarified again. This promises no perfect conversation but preserves two distinct offers. Support does not require proving the event useful. Someone can offer what is actually possible and hear the response to that offer. Assistance can be limited and still have significance independent of an elegant conclusion about the whole story.

Gratitude for assistance contains no automatic decision about forgiving the acquaintance. These relationships involve different people and circumstances. Pavel may value the friend’s presence, avoid meeting the acquaintance, and remain unsure how to discuss the broken arrangement. No one must allocate final assessments to everyone before another drawing begins. A demand for immediate forgiveness changes the conversation’s subject again. Discussion remains possible, but agreement to it cannot be inferred from useful assistance. The essay determines no response needed by a particular person in a particular relationship. It distinguishes what has been agreed, what has been offered, and what has not yet been discussed.

A helper also has limits. They can name available time, offer to resume the search later, or admit uncertainty about further assistance. These words do not require Pavel to find meaning

faster for the meeting to count as successful. An activity may end without a shared conclusion: an image was or was not found, a folder partly checked, another attempt postponed. The meeting has a factual result even when small. Its modesty need not be compensated by a grand renewal story. Both people can retain their own relation to the event. Arranging another activity is a new question, neither payment for earlier help nor a promise to narrate the loss as the listener prefers.

IX. The next activity can be smaller than the whole story

On another day Pavel may open a photograph, choose paper, or do something entirely different. These actions need no identical assessment. Sometimes a chosen step relates to loss; sometimes it concerns only today’s necessity. Buying groceries need not represent meaning’s restoration, and another drawing need not prove victory over the past. An activity’s scale concerns its actual subject and what is possible now. The scene supplies no information about Pavel’s time, energy, or other commitments; a correct pace cannot be prescribed. A small question can remain open: what activity does he want to choose, if any, today? Having no answer does not turn the whole day into a failed examination.

A chosen activity can be described without grand significance. Pavel viewed three images, labelled a folder, spoke to his friend, or postponed work. These words retain a verifiable subject within the invented scene. He may later give an activity personal meaning; none may exist now. Acknowledging a small result does not demand satisfaction with it. Someone can notice what they did while still wanting what cannot be recovered. These responses need no common moral. Interest in another activity may also be partial: present today, unknown tomorrow. The essay leaves room for uncertainty instead of turning one evening into a promise of lasting life change.

A small step is not a disguised standard of constant productivity. Rest, no written record, or another conversational subject remain possible. Necessary practical assistance has actual conditions that philosophical explanation does not replace. Our scene is deliberately limited to an ordinary conversation about drawings. It supplies no ready answer for every loss, dangerous circumstance, or life decision. A reader may retain only the distinction between subjects and leave the exercise unused. Including a voluntary exercise does not require completion, disclosure, or proof that a difficult experience has finally entered a finished narrative. The next day can also remain a day of particular activities.

X. Significance can appear without a final justification

If Pavel later calls a new drawing important, that assessment has a specific subject. It need not finish the conversation about the sketchbook. Knowing earlier pages cannot return can coexist with valuing today's work. The sequence of time permits both responses. No proof is required that value could never have appeared without loss: the scene contains no comparison with an unlived life. Personal meaning may concern what is done now rather than the purpose of an entire past. This limit keeps discovered words precise. They can be modest, changeable, private, and no explanation of another's experience. A sincere conclusion to one meeting need not turn the whole story into a completed parable.

The sources participate differently. Job's final passage limits the confident explaining voice; SN36.6 retains a Buddhist distinction between feelings and response; Plato's episode concerns the justice of a chosen response to an order. These are different grounds, not ancient certification of one modern technique. Our shared discussion is limited to an event, words about it, and present action. It establishes neither the meaning a reader must find nor when it must appear. Pavel remains an invented example of an ordinary conversation. Neither a new drawing nor a lack of interest in it permits judgement of someone's feelings, maturity, or the success of their subsequent life.

Two sentences may remain alongside each other: what happened was unwanted for me; today's activity has significance I choose to name. The first does not cancel the second, and the second grants no consent to the first. Even these words are an option rather than a compulsory conclusion. Sometimes only one sentence is chosen, or neither yet. Meaning need not report the usefulness of every difficult experience. Its personal form may appear in a small decision, conversation, or memory, or remain an open question. It needs no grand title in advance. A person can retain distinctions between what happened, what others offered to explain, and what they wish to approach today.

What this means in practice

If you wish, choose one small question that matters now. No hardest experience, personal disclosure, or whole-story explanation is needed. Make no record if preferred and stop at any step.

Name a known fact, your relation to it, and one present activity or decision against activity separately. Leave unknown causes unknown. If a useful thought appears, consider its subject: does it concern today's activity or require the earlier event to have been necessary? Neither question demands an answer.

Clarify an offer of help if wanted: what is possible, whether it is wanted, and what has been agreed. Gratitude for help obliges no gratitude for the event, forgiveness, or common conclusion. Another conversation can wait. This voluntary editorial exercise distinguishes subjects of speech; it is no diagnosis, treatment, or proven way to change feelings. Its efficacy is unestablished. No disclosure, positive lesson, or permanent conclusion is required. End with a specific sentence, open question, or a decision to explain nothing for now.

Key quotation

> *“but I went quietly home.”*

— Plato, Apology, Leon account,32c–d; Benjamin Jowett translation, exact selected clause with its source final period.

Connections between traditions

1. **Explanation’s limit — Job 42:7–8 ↔ SN36.6, the two-arrow image.** God rejects the friends’ speech in Job’s final scene; the Buddhist discourse distinguishes bodily painful feeling from added mental suffering through a second-arrow image. The editorial comparison separates what is said or added after an event from the event itself. Pavel can distinguish losing his sketchbook from his friend’s claim about its supposed benefit. A theological rebuke nevertheless differs from Buddhist analysis of feeling, and another’s words do not cause all experience. The article assigns no second-arrow blame, promises no disappearance of pain, and derives no diagnosis. Actual harm and available assistance retain separate significance.

2. **A response’s value — Apology 32c–d, Leon ↔ Job 42:3, 7–8.** Socrates describes refusing to bring Leon for execution, preserving the ethical object of his action; Job acknowledges limits in speaking about what he did not understand, while God separately assesses the friends’ speech. Their comparative field is a later response whose content certifies no earlier event’s goodness. Pavel’s present drawing can matter without justifying his lost sketchbook. Socratic defence and biblical relation to God supply no shared teaching about hardship’s benefits. Readers need reproduce neither risk, confession, nor prayer. Later significance proves no necessary harm or benevolent design.

3. **Feeling and assertion — SN36.6, painful feeling ↔ Job 42:3 and 7.** The Buddhist text examines bodily pain and different responses; Job’s acknowledgment of incomplete understanding is distinct from God’s rebuke of the friends’ speech. The article compares experience with assertions about what happened as subjects requiring different questions. Pavel can acknowledge loss without accepting his friend’s claim of benefit. Buddhist liberation and biblical dispute nevertheless form no shared psychological model. Declining an explanation guarantees no changed feeling and assigns no sufferer a moral rank. No modern

causal mechanism is established, nor is a strong response called an error. Available information and actual harm require particular consideration.

4. **Event and present action — Apology 32c–d ↔ SN36.6, one and two arrows.** Socrates distinguishes the command to bring Leon from his own refused participation; SN36.6 distinguishes painful feeling from subsequent response within its Buddhist ground. Their comparative field separates what is answered from the answer's particular content. Pavel's drawing today can be considered apart from the destroyed sketchbook. Ethical refusal under threat and Buddhist liberation nevertheless differ from an ordinary activity and set no required endurance measure. The article prescribes neither dangerous resistance nor absent feelings. A present action need not make loss desirable, necessary, or good; declining to draw remains possible.

5. **Another account and a personal conclusion — Job 42:7–8 ↔ Apology 32c–d, Socrates's account.** God assesses Job's friends' words, while Socrates himself narrates his refusal concerning Leon and its ethical grounds. The comparison asks who speaks, about which action, and with what authority to determine meaning. The article permits an offered interpretation and its refusal rather than finishing another's story for them. Divine judgement grants no modern listener its authority, and Socrates's defence establishes no universal advice-refusal exercise. Meaning found by one person becomes no compulsory lesson for another. The friend's opinion is not equated with these ancient voices; useful clarification remains possible.

6. **An unfinished account and specific help — SN36.6, retained painful feeling ↔ Job 42:3 and 8.** The Buddhist distinction retains bodily pain even without a second arrow; Job's limited understanding stands alongside a specified action for his friends within a religious context. Their comparative field is particular involvement that need not mean complete explanation or a difficulty's disappearance. Searching for a photograph has its own conditions and result while loss's meaning remains open. Buddhist liberation and biblical intercession prescribe no modern assistance and prove no exercise outcome. The search demands neither gratitude for loss, forgiveness, prayer, nor public renewal. Actual help's availability requires separate checking without a guarantee it will exist.

Primary sources

1. Job; King James Version translators — Job42:1–8 KJV. Actual reading scope, translation, and limits are retained in the source ledger.

2. Buddhist Pali Canon; Ṭhānissaro Bhikkhu translator — SN36.6, The Arrow. Actual reading scope, translation, and limits are retained in the source ledger.

3. Plato; Benjamin Jowett translator — Apology, Leon refusal account. Actual reading scope, translation, and limits are retained in the source ledger.

Tags

meaning, difficult experience, personal significance, cause, assessment, interpretation, loss, assistance, support, conversation, consent, gratitude, forgiveness, memory, unfinished account, choice, present day, drawing, personal story, Job, SN36.6, two arrows, Buddhism, Plato, Apology, Socrates, Leon, justice, primary sources, voluntary exercise

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.