

UNITED WISDOM

Forgiving Oneself: Responsibility for the Past and Permission to Continue

Meaning and Direction

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

P35 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Forgiving Oneself: Responsibility for the Past and Permission to Continue

Epigraph

I pardon you this time:

— Seneca, Of Anger III.36; opening self-address clause followed by warning not to repeat; Aubrey Stewart, 1889

What this article is about

Pavel opened an old presentation to correct the name of the person who had written one of its sections. Six months earlier, he knew Nina had done the calculations, yet allowed his manager to describe the result as his own work. The record could now be corrected. The conversation could not be undone, the praise taken back, or Nina required to trust him again. Even after making the correction, Pavel wondered whether he was entitled to enjoy dinner, laugh with his daughter, or plan a holiday. Ordinary life seemed like further evidence of his shamelessness. This imagined scene makes the question of forgiving oneself more precise than a promise to start with a clean slate. How can someone acknowledge an action as their own without turning the rest of life into punishment? We compare particular grounds in Seneca, Aristotle, and the story of Zacchaeus while preserving their different purposes. Our subject is a person's relation to their past, rather than a means of obtaining another person's forgiveness or guaranteed emotional relief.

I. What exactly is someone trying to forgive?

Forgiveness can refer to different things. Someone may want to stop denying a mistake, stop repeating an inward sentence, or obtain permission to leave everything unrepaired. These intentions cannot be combined in one comforting formula. Pavel really did take credit for part of someone else's work: that is established in our scene, rather than inferred from his guilty feelings. Calling it a misunderstanding would make the account easier to bear but less truthful. Calling himself someone permanently forbidden to enjoy anything would make it harsher without making it more accurate. An action needs a specific description. A lifelong prohibition on ordinary living would need a different justification, which acknowledging the action does not itself provide. First identify the actual demand.

The opposite danger is treating every painful regret as proof of guilt. A person may regret a decision whose consequences were unavailable to them, or their inability to protect someone

under conditions they did not control. That situation differs from knowingly taking another person's credit. The first question, therefore, is not a demand to confess immediately to having a bad character. It is more modest: what is known about the event, what did I actually do, what did I not know, and what could I influence? The answer may retain or reduce responsibility, or disprove the accusation. This is not a judicial assessment. It is a way of refusing to make the intensity of self-accusation the sole witness to what happened.

Here, forgiving oneself will mean a limited possibility: while keeping a truthful account of the past and the obligations still available, a person need not demand that their entire future become a continuous enactment of punishment. Other descriptions include mercy toward oneself, ending inward punishment, or permission to act again. They may not yet have a suitable word at all. The label should not become another test of maturity. For Pavel, correcting the record and respecting Nina's boundary matter more than delivering an impressive declaration of self-acceptance. Further action is possible before final inward reconciliation. That is this article's editorial position, not a single doctrine attributed to all the sources being compared.

II. Explaining an action does not automatically excuse it

Pavel can remember his fear of losing his job, his habit of staying quiet before a manager, and his wish to receive recognition at last. These circumstances help explain how he made the choice. They do not make Nina's work his own. Explanation is useful when it does not dissolve the facts. It can reveal conditions under which the action might recur: for example, another person's name disappearing from a document before any public praise is given. Yet an explanatory account also needs room for the other person's loss. If the whole account concerns Pavel's fear, Nina again becomes a marginal figure in his story. His fear is real, but his experience alone does not describe the whole event.

In Nicomachean Ethics III.1, Aristotle distinguishes compulsion, ignorance of particular circumstances, and actions originating in the agent. He also considers mixed cases in which choices are made under serious pressure. This prevents two hasty conclusions: that every action is equally free, and that every unpleasant motive removes responsibility. For our question, attention to the particular case is valuable in itself. Pavel's contemporary situation cannot simply be inserted into an ancient classification to obtain an infallible verdict. We can nevertheless ask whether he knew where the calculations came from, whether he participated in choosing silence, and what restrictions actually existed. Details change the action's description, not merely our tone.

Aristotle does not treat anger or desire alone as sufficient reason to call an action involuntary. His discussion also contains severe historical judgments that we do not adopt as a ready-made way to judge every contemporary person. This article does not require someone to settle the

entire measure of their fault in one evening. Facts may conflict, participants may remember things differently, and pressure may be difficult to describe. Leaving part of the judgment open can be more honest than offering a convenient excuse or a final condemnation. Pavel knows enough to correct the name in the presentation even while he does not understand every cause of his conduct. Action needs no complete theory of personality, but known facts must remain distinct from convenient feelings.

III. Regret does not tell the whole story

In the morning Pavel may be thinking about Nina; in the evening, about how the team now sees him. Both thoughts can coexist. We need not declare all regret selfish to notice that they concern different things. In one case his attention turns to the person whose work he concealed; in the other, to his own reputation. Calling both simply suffering makes it difficult to see which action answers which question. Correcting authorship concerns the record of the work. Patience with another person's distrust concerns the consequences of his conduct. Wanting his former image of himself back does not confer a separate right to manage Nina's response. This distinction keeps discomfort from becoming universal compensation.

In the selected Aristotelian passage, pain and repentance help distinguish actions done through ignorance. This does not mean that intense pain proves innocence, or that a calm voice proves shamelessness. The discussion concerns a particular kind of action and its circumstances. A contemporary person may experience responsibility unevenly, lack words for it, or look calm while continuing to accept consequences. The reverse is possible too: an emotional speech does not correct a record. We establish no scale for the proper intensity of regret. What matters is keeping evidence about an inward condition distinct from evidence about the event itself. Both matter, but neither automatically entails or replaces the other.

Sometimes a person expects an act of repair to bring relief automatically. If relief does not arrive, they decide the act was pointless or insufficient. In our scene, the record remains corrected even on a difficult evening. This is no evidence of psychological efficacy, which the article does not promise. It distinguishes changing an available fact from changing a feeling. Nina receives accurate credit regardless of how quickly Pavel feels better. The distinction protects correction from being required to serve his inward condition immediately. It also prevents the absence of relief from becoming a new accusation. Ordinary tasks and regret can coexist without implying final forgiveness, treatment, or moral settlement.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

IV. Seneca: examination without concealment

In Of Anger III.36, Seneca describes examining his own words and actions. Two neighbouring features matter: he conceals nothing from himself, and he allows pardon while connecting it to what should not be repeated. This is not an invitation to call everything good. His examples are specific: arguing too aggressively, or offering a reprimand that offended instead of correcting. The passage provides a limited basis for thinking of mercy together with examination, rather than in its place. Pavel can retain the sentence, “I stayed silent while knowing who had made the calculations,” without adding, “Therefore my whole life must now be miserable.” The second statement changes the object of judgment rather than adding detail.

Seneca's historical scene remains historical. His domestic arrangement, conception of moral judgment, and assessments of others do not become a compulsory evening ritual for every reader. Nor do we turn his praise of the sleep following examination into a contemporary recommendation with demonstrated efficacy. We borrow a narrower distinction: examination can end with a particular observation about conduct rather than indefinitely accumulating accusations. If the known fact is that someone's name was concealed, a useful review does not necessarily improve by repeating progressively harsher descriptions of oneself. Stopping the review does not mean hiding a newly relevant detail. The limit concerns known repetition, not newly relevant truth.

On this reading, forgiveness is not awarded in advance for an eloquent confession. Forgiveness permits further life without treating that permission as another punishment. Pavel can still notice a familiar temptation to stay quiet, take responsibility for his part in the next document, and correct an inaccuracy. None of this guarantees an error-free future. Requiring him to promise never to cause any harm again would demand an assurance that cannot be verified beforehand. A more particular commitment has an object and boundaries: keep a known author's name, identify contributions explicitly, and avoid using Nina's absence to create another convenient account. This example shows how changed conduct can be more precise than declaring oneself beyond amendment; it is no universal procedure.

V. Repair has an object and a limit

In Luke's story of Zacchaeus, the promise of restitution occurs within an encounter with Jesus. Zacchaeus speaks of restoring what was taken through false accusation; the following words concern salvation and descent from Abraham. This religious narrative cannot be reduced to “pay, and you will be free.” It provides no universal contemporary multiplier for compensation either. What matters here is the direction of the promise: it concerns something taken from another, rather than only the speaker's inward burden. Pavel can consider available restoration without equating corrected authorship with the Gospel narrative. The passage does not require Nina to judge the correction sufficient or resume a friendship. Her response is not specified by the analogy.

The past cannot always be repaired through the same kind of act that caused the damage. A removed name can return to a document; a lost opportunity to speak at a meeting cannot return to its original day. Money can be repaid, while time cannot simply be issued again. This does not make partial correction useless. It prevents exaggerating its reach. If Pavel announces that everything is restored, he again claims authority to describe Nina's experience. If he says that no correction matters because the past day is unavailable, he leaves an available loss unattended. Between these extremes lies a limited act: change what can actually be changed without declaring everything else changed, or demanding an inward or outward reward for doing it.

There is also a limit to approaching the person who was harmed. In our scene Nina agrees to the record being clarified but does not want a personal meeting. Her refusal need not become part of Pavel's punishment or an obstacle he is required to overcome. It is her boundary. He can direct the correction to the place where the inaccurate record arose without making Nina a witness to his relief. Apology, negotiation, and legal procedures are separate questions, not supplied here. It is enough here to notice that wanting to stop hating oneself does not grant access to another person's time, feelings, or response. Even a sincere need to hear forgiveness remains a need rather than an entitlement.

VI. Another person does not issue permission for an entire life

Another person's forgiveness may matter deeply, but its absence cannot automatically be read as an order prohibiting all future life. Nina may not forgive Pavel, explain her position, or wish to return to the event. It follows that he has not received her forgiveness or renewed relationship. It does not follow that he must abandon contact with his daughter, care for his home, or every future piece of work. Those relationships do not belong to Nina and are not evidence of exoneration. The distinction preserves the significance of her response without requiring her to issue a comprehensive moral passport without which he can never act anywhere again. Her life need not serve his inward tribunal.

Someone else may quickly say that they forgot the matter long ago. That too does not automatically erase the event. Their words can be accepted without requiring them to relive the loss in detail for the sake of one's own demand for punishment. An available correction can continue if the record is still inaccurate. Forgiveness and fact are not connected like a switch that makes the past never have happened. Luke's account preserves Zacchaeus's particular promise within a religious encounter; Seneca connects inward pardon with an observation about conduct. Their grounds differ, but neither selected passage requires mercy to mean the disappearance of every concrete matter. The contemporary conclusion about limits to another person's participation remains our editorial conclusion, not their shared literal command.

One cannot forgive oneself on behalf of the person who was hurt. Pavel can change his relation to his own life without attributing agreement to Nina. “I have decided to forgive myself” therefore needs a modest continuation: what changes for me, and what remains another person's decision? In our scene, what changes is the demand to punish himself during every pleasant event. Accurate credit, the possibility of distrust, and Nina's decision not to meet remain. This promises no flawless resolution. Several relationships can remain unfinished. Incompleteness need imply neither final purity nor permanent exclusion from human activity. Permission to continue does not require taking possession of someone else's voice or silence.

VII. When punishment stops describing responsibility

After correcting the record, Pavel may deny himself small pleasures repeatedly, as though each deprivation restores Nina's loss. Yet refusing dinner with his family changes no authorship, restores no time, and gives Nina no choice. Within this imagined scene, we can examine that without making a general claim about the benefit or harm of every feeling: which consequence of the event will this particular deprivation change? Some restrictions genuinely concern responsibility, such as no longer handling someone else's material without checking. Such a restriction has an object. A prohibition on every good moment does not acquire one merely by being severe. Conviction does not show what is returned, or to whom.

Stopping is especially difficult when suffering has become the measure of sincerity. A calm day then looks like betrayal of the acknowledgment, and ordinary laughter like another offence. We promise neither disappearance nor easy cessation of the feeling. The question is different: must an acknowledgment be confirmed every day by the same intensity of pain? Seneca's examination of particular harshness allows the review to end, with attention directed toward subsequent conduct. That supplies a historical basis for a limited analogy, not a calming technique with promised results. For Pavel, it opens the possibility of regarding a corrected record as corrected even on a day when he did not suffer all evening. Facts need no continuous emotional signature.

Continuing life need not be a reward for successfully completing repair. Otherwise someone facing an irreversible loss would have no possibility of moving forward at all. Nor must continuation become proof that everything happened for the best. Pavel need not turn taking credit into a beneficial stage of personal growth to be entitled to another day. The act can be called wrong and remain wrong. Participation in ordinary affairs does not rewrite that judgment. Mercy toward oneself limits the spread of the sentence across one's entire existence, while responsibility keeps the particular event definite. No ready-made feeling of balance is promised. These two concerns make it possible not to condition future life on an impossible, total restoration of the past.

VIII. The past action and the present person

It is convenient to describe the past through a final label: liar, traitor, coward. Such a word may express an important experience of another participant, and this article does not demand that everyone be forbidden to use it. But when Pavel makes it his only name for himself, the account stops distinguishing actions. It no longer says where he stays silent now, where he clarifies, what he did today, or what he failed to do. Responsibility requires memory, yet memory can preserve an event more precisely than an all-encompassing label. Rejecting a label must not conceal repetition, however. If Pavel removes another person's name again, the new entry requires new attention. Declaring oneself changed neither exempts subsequent actions from scrutiny nor confers permanent decency.

A change in conduct is not proved by one impressive gesture either. Pavel may correct the presentation while still resenting colleagues who mention Nina. He may speak more calmly and still want to excuse himself. These contradictions do not make every correction false, but they leave matters unfinished. What interests us is not a requirement to become a new person by a deadline, but the possibility of distinguishing the directions of actions. One habit preserves the old convenience; another makes contributions visible. This is a local distinction, not a psychological diagnosis or an established method of shaping character. Aristotle's attention to

the acting person helps formulate a concrete question, without promising that a few right decisions guarantee a final moral transformation.

Not every consequence allows a change to be demonstrated to the person who was harmed. Nina may leave the team, never see later documents, and have no wish to receive news about Pavel. The absence of that witness does not remove his possibility of choosing differently. It also does not permit him to imagine her as an invisible, grateful participant. He can act more accurately without an audience, preserve an account of the earlier action without daily public confession, and allow that another person's opinion may not change. Further life is freed from two demands: endlessly proving one's corruption, and necessarily winning recognition of one's amendment. Particular present activities remain, sometimes modest and unable to complete the whole story.

IX. Different grounds for mercy

The three selected texts offer no identical doctrine of forgiving oneself. Seneca examines words and actions within moral self-government. Aristotle distinguishes grounds of voluntary and involuntary action without supplying a contemporary programme of inward forgiveness. Luke's account connects Zacchaeus's particular promise with meeting Jesus and salvation. These differences are not decorative additions around a shared piece of advice. They change who assesses the action, what is assessed, and what continuation means. Removing the Gospel narrative's religious grounds would produce another narrative. Calling Aristotle's classification a technique for getting rid of guilt would offer a promise absent from the selected passage. Useful comparison preserves distinctions instead of hiding them behind convenient unanimity.

A reader may accept a religious ground, reject it, or leave the question open. Their understanding of mercy and hope will differ accordingly. This article does not assign every position equally to each source or require a change of beliefs as the price of continuing life. The contemporary question proposed here is narrower: what do I acknowledge, what actions remain possible, and which decision of another person can I not take over? Answering it does not settle salvation or replace a personal religious conversation. It preserves scope for present action. Pavel can identify the author of the calculations accurately without casting himself as Zacchaeus or expecting colleagues to supply a Gospel ending. An analogy reveals an object of restoration, rather than assigning roles to living people.

Keeping grounds distinct is especially important when someone is vulnerable to confident formulas. They may be promised complete release after confession, inevitable relief after repair, or permission to forget everything after one decision. None of those guarantees is needed for the limited position offered here. A feeling can remain heavy, the past action wrong, and another person's response unknown without requiring an endless inward

execution. This is not a new universal formula that must be accepted immediately. It is a way of examining possible continuation while leaving facts intact. Readers may postpone reflection or seek other language. There is no urgent deadline for reconciliation with oneself, and declining the proposed practice is not judged a moral defect.

X. Continuing without rewriting the past

Our scene ends without a decisive letter from Nina. The presentation is corrected, the manager has received a clarification, and no personal meeting has taken place. Pavel goes home and helps his daughter assemble a model boat. He may remember the earlier act while doing this, or stop thinking about it for a while. Neither state by itself turns the boat into restitution or a new offence. Ordinary life returns at its own scale: a separate activity with another person, rather than proof that the story with Nina is complete. This modest fictional ending guarantees no similar real outcome. It shows only that retained responsibility can coexist with available human participation, without either being used to cancel the other.

Permission to continue is not permission to hide consequences. Pavel cannot demand that colleagues never mention the earlier presentation or declare every instance of distrust unfair. He can, however, refuse to give the past authority to prohibit every subsequent activity. The distinction between memory and a total command is useful here. Memory says: this happened, I did it, and these consequences are known. The total command adds: from now on everything good in my life is forbidden. Refusing the second statement does not require denying the first. A precise record can be kept, and available actions reconsidered if new information emerges. Incompleteness needs honesty, not necessarily continuous accusation or refusal of every future possibility.

Forgiving oneself in the sense described offers no blank sheet, but the possibility of another line. The sheet still contains the action, another person's contribution, an irreversible day, and that person's boundaries. Writing another line does not repair these facts. It may contain a more accurate act, ordinary care, needed rest, or only an acknowledgment that matters remain unfinished. It need not be inspirational. Mercy toward oneself supplies no retrospective excuse; it limits the demand to turn existence into endless punishment. Responsibility does not require abandoning all life; it preserves what is known and what remains available. Between them, a person can continue without promising to forget finally, earn universal trust, or make a past mistake into a useful lesson for everyone involved.

What this means in practice

If this question is appropriate now, you might choose one event about which enough is known and distinguish four matters briefly: what happened; your particular part; what can still be changed; and which decision remains another person's. This is an invitation to reflection, not a test of moral maturity. There is no need to choose the most painful episode, disclose it to anyone, or obtain a final verdict. Where facts are unclear, the note can say that part of the assessment remains open. Guilty feelings need not be intensified to produce the right answer.

You might separately notice one deprivation associated with a need to punish yourself. Which known consequence of the event does it change? If there is no answer, that is a reason to examine the connection, not an order to stop feeling burdened immediately. An available correction and ordinary care for the present day can exist alongside one another. Testing this must not mean intruding across another person's boundary: a refusal of contact need not be overcome to obtain relief.

The note can end with a limited sentence: “I do not declare the past right; this action is available to me today.” The action might be a correction, a clarification, refraining from a familiar step, or an ordinary task unrelated to restitution. You may write nothing and postpone the exercise. It promises neither the disappearance of guilt, another person's forgiveness, treatment, nor restored relationships, and does not replace help that a person themselves considers necessary.

Key quotation

> *I restore him fourfold.*

— Luke 19:8, final clause of Zacchaeus’s conditional promise; King James Version

Connections between traditions

Question

First textual ground

Second textual ground

Comparison mechanism

What does not follow

Responsibility and the particular case

Aristotle, III.1, carrier 27–38: external compulsion and mixed actions differ according to circumstances and the agent’s participation.

Seneca, III.36, carrier 919–920: an excessive dispute and an offending reprimand are named, rather than only a general bad label.

Distinguishing grounds in Aristotle and particular words in Seneca helps ask about Pavel’s part before assessing his entire life.

This is no judicial classification of a contemporary case and does not prove that every unpleasant motive excuses taking credit.

Repentance and the event’s description

Aristotle, III.1, 39–47: repentance concerns acts through ignorance of particulars; general moral error is distinguished from that ignorance.

Luke 19:8, carrier 37: restoration is declared conditionally concerning what was taken through false accusation.

Both passages require an object: ignorance of what, or restoration of what. Feeling does not replace checking what is known about the event.

Intense regret does not prove innocence; Zacchaeus’s story sets no compulsory amount of contemporary compensation.

Mercy and subsequent particulars

Seneca, III.36, 919: inward pardon accompanies a warning not to repeat and examination of harshness.

Luke 19:5–10, 32–41: receiving Zacchaeus, his promise, and words about salvation occur within an encounter with Jesus.

An observation about conduct remains in Seneca; a promise and religious ground remain in Luke. Mercy is not portrayed as merely erasing every detail.

These are different moral and religious grounds, not a single secular therapy; no present relief or salvation is guaranteed.

Inward examination and an outward object

Seneca, III.36, 918–920: words and actions are reviewed without concealment, and a reprimand is considered for the offence it caused.

Luke 19:8, 37: the promise concerns returning what was taken from another, rather than only the speaker’s condition.

The comparison keeps two questions together: what someone acknowledges inwardly, and what action concerns another’s loss. Neither absorbs the other.

Nina’s contemporary boundary is an editorial development of the scene; neither passage grants Pavel her meeting, gratitude, or forgiveness.

Not every motive cancels participation

Aristotle, III.1, 48–51: anger and desire alone do not make actions involuntary.

Seneca, III.36, 919–920: the speaker acknowledges excessive harshness and considers its consequences for the interlocutor.

Both concrete grounds prevent substituting the name of an emotion for the action. Pavel’s fear matters without making another’s calculations his own.

Historical severity and hierarchy are not adopted as universal current verdicts; freedom must be considered in each case’s circumstances.

Continuation without a comprehensive moral passport

Seneca, III.36, 919: examination can reach a limit while preserving an observation concerning subsequent conduct.

Aristotle, III.1, 44–48: particular circumstances and the source of action substantially affect its description.

The article combines precise memory with refusing to spread a sentence across every future minute. This is a limited contemporary conclusion from distinct questions.

Neither passage grants a lifelong certificate of amendment; new actions still need attention, and another person’s opinion may not change.

Primary sources

1. **Seneca, *Of Anger*, III.36.** Aubrey Stewart's named translation in *Minor Dialogues Together with the Dialogue on Clemency*, London, 1889; the edition title was actually checked. The complete selected carrier 917–920 and neighbouring domestic context were read. Examination and pardon concern particular harshness; praise of sleep and historical hierarchy are not turned into a contemporary prescription. Primary text.

2. **Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, III.1.** W. D. Ross's named translation in the Internet Classics Archive; the translator header and complete selected chapter 27–51 were read. This carrier does not establish a checked printed edition date here. Compulsion, ignorance of particulars, and agency are distinguished; no contemporary legal or clinical verdict is supplied. Primary text.

3. **Luke 19:1–10, KJV.** All ten selected verses and edition label were read. The conditional promise in verse 8 remains within meeting Jesus and words about salvation, rather than becoming a universal price of forgiveness. Primary text.

The two short Russian quotations are United Wisdom's own translations from the named English carriers. Literal English clauses were checked against Stewart and KJV. No whole-work reading, Latin/Greek collation, demonstrated therapeutic efficacy or blanket international commercial rights is claimed; ledger rights remain UNKNOWN. The main text and contemporary boundaries are an original limited comparison, with no raw source import or vectorisation.

Tags

self-forgiveness, responsibility, past, mercy, self-punishment, action, regret, repentance, correction, restitution, boundaries, trust, acknowledgment, honesty, memory, choice, voluntariness, compulsion, ignorance, Aristotle, Seneca, Zacchaeus, Luke, continuation, ordinary life, consequences, authorship, uncertainty, care, permission to continue

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.