

UNITED WISDOM

Legacy: what remains of a person in other people’s lives

Meaning and Direction

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

P40 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Legacy: what remains of a person in other people’s lives

Epigraph

> *yet no man remembered that same poor man*

— Ecclesiastes 9:15, King James Version, exact fragment; lowercase retained.

What this article is about

Legacy is often discussed as if a person had to build a monument to their own life in advance. Yet more than a name remains in other people's lives: skills they have received, an accessible undertaking, a way of speaking, work completed in time, an experience of care, or consequences of harm. These traces differ. Remembrance may disappear after an act has already changed someone's circumstances; a name may survive while what was passed on no longer helps. This article considers legacy without promising immortality or requiring something great to be left behind. It asks what another person actually receives, whether they can use it, and whether they retain the right to respond differently from the giver's expectations. Legacy here concerns a connection between my life and another person's continuing participation. It does not give me possession of the future. The connection needs specificity, honest remembrance, and acknowledgment of the limits of influence.

I. A name, remembrance, and an actual trace

“Leave” joins different wishes: to be remembered, have work continue, help loved ones live more easily, or keep experience from vanishing. None reduces entirely to another. Naming a street after a teacher is one form of remembrance; learning to listen carefully to a question is another consequence of the relationship. An inscription does not prove the lesson continues, nor does its absence make the encounters pointless. Legacy becomes more precise when importance is examined through a recipient and something received. Who received what, and under which conditions did it remain available?

In Ecclesiastes 9:13–18, a poor wise man's help to a city stands alongside the failure to remember him. The story distinguishes a useful act from later recognition. It promises no hidden reward for the forgotten person and explains no universal pattern of public ingratitude. For this subject, the divergence itself is sufficient. A benefit may be real without a complete account of its author's name; remembrance may need restoring even after the benefit occurred. There are two separate reasons for attention: noticing a particular contribution, and

refusing to make fame the sole evidence of human worth. Requiring renown from every good act impoverishes what we can recognize in relationships before we have examined what actually happened between the people involved.

There is no need to shame the wish to be named. The creator of work may reasonably want accurate attribution, and a loved one may want a recognizable place in family remembrance. The difficulty is not the wish itself but its substitution for a demand: another person's life must continually confirm my importance. Recipients have their own attention, memory, and undertakings. They may remember differently or not know the name behind conditions that have become available to them. This limits the giver's control without removing the possibility of recognition. We can preserve names where they are known, thank people for particular contributions, and still avoid treating every instance of forgetting as proof that someone left nothing. Legacy allows more than one scale of description.

II. What is received needs room to be used

Imagine a fictional workshop. Its former craftsperson leaves a bench, explanatory notebook, and people they taught. The room could be preserved untouched, the tools sold, or work continued differently. Surviving objects do not tell us what happened to the undertaking. If nobody can use the equipment or understand the notebook, intactness does not mean accessible transmission. Conversely, changed tools need not mean lost substance: learners may retain attention to quality. Assessment must distinguish objects, methods, conditions of use, and people's own decisions. Counting untouched things cannot establish what remains alive in present work.

In the first chapter of Democracy and Education, Dewey relates the continuation of social life to transmission and communication. This is a philosophical account, not evidence that a particular workshop will succeed. It helps us notice why handing over an object and making experience understandable are different acts. Transmission meets another person's understanding. They may ask a question, uncover a gap, or use what they received in a new case. An explanation then becomes more than a recollection of the former craftsperson's method: it becomes material for present work. In this fictional situation, that might mean explaining the reason for a check instead of demanding that a gesture be repeated forever in its former order. Meaning survives through understanding, which an instruction cannot entirely replace.

Yet not every change should be declared faithful continuation. An important check may be lost, authorship erased, damage caused, or the undertaking itself abandoned. Each case needs its own grounds for assessment. Invoking the recipient's freedom does not justify deception; invoking loyalty to the craftsperson does not justify forbidding a reasonable change. Legacy supplies no single verdict for everyone. It raises a more definite question: what was passed on

as valuable, which commitments were actually accepted, and what is happening to them now? Known substance can be discussed. If the only thing known is a prohibition on change, transmission risks preserving dependence rather than the ability to act. Detailed handover deserves separate examination; here the distinction between an intact shell and an accessible undertaking matters.

III. A person remains in ways of treating others

Some things received fit no box: a conversation partner who did not interrupt a question, a colleague who admitted a mistake, a neighbour who helped without humiliation. Later someone may act similarly without naming the source. This is neither an absent person's literal presence nor a complete account of character. Many encounters, circumstances, and one's own decisions contribute. A particular memory can name a connection without inventing a sole rescuer. Instead of “they made me who I am,” one can name a way of avoiding shame. Gratitude then retains room for one's own understanding.

The first book of Marcus Aurelius's reflections names things received from relatives and teachers. In sections I–IV of the selected edition, this is a grateful naming of qualities and ways of learning, rather than a claim that the learner entirely reproduces each mentor. Specific attribution matters for this article. We can notice where we encountered patience, attentive reading, or room to express a thought freely. We need not accept that person's whole biography as an unconditional model. One meaningful way of treating people may be valuable alongside other limitations and mistakes. Such remembrance does not justify bad conduct through good conduct; it distinguishes sides of a relationship. A received example ceases to require reverence for the entire person when its substance and limits are named.

A trace in the way people are treated is not always favourable. Harshness, silent submission, or a habit of concealing mistakes may also be part of what others received around us. The question of legacy therefore cannot be settled through the intention to be kind alone. Another person needs room to name their experience without maintaining our portrait. Their account may be unexpected or unwelcome. Listening does not mean accepting every judgment immediately as final; it means not taking away the recipient's right to testify. Naming particular actions makes discussion possible without compressing a whole life into one word. If an influence was harmful, the person continuing to live may refuse to reproduce it. That too is a response to what was received, even if the giver cannot regard it as familiar gratitude.

IV. Care need not become a monument

Part of a human trace is another person's opportunity to get through an ordinary day. Prepared food, understandable explanations, completed work, or room to rest has a recipient and a time, without necessarily producing a museum object. Looking only for durable things misses such conditions for action. Naming them matters without declaring every household contribution heroic sacrifice. It might have been agreed work, friendly participation, or demanding labour insufficiently recognized. These distinctions concern actual relations; an attractive account of care should not erase them or turn the recipient into a monument.

Care does not acquire meaning only after the carer's death or departure. While people can still talk, they can clarify burdens, express thanks, share work, and correct an unfair arrangement. Conversation about a future legacy should not postpone these acts until a ceremonial remembrance. If someone is exhausted by constant helping, asking them to leave a bright trace does not address their present situation. Their right to rest and pursue their own activity remains. Recipients, too, need not turn help into an eternal debt. They can acknowledge assistance without promising the same response in every future situation. Mutual attention makes gratitude specific; without it, remembrance of care may preserve precisely the unfairness that an attractive account conceals from those who hear it.

It is difficult to know in advance which contribution another person will remember. They may name a small encounter we barely noticed, or not recall an act that required great effort. This divergence establishes neither ingratitude nor the worthlessness of the work automatically. A recipient's memory is not an exact counter of the giver's expenditure. Two conversations are needed: one about the fair distribution of today's work, another about what became meaningful in someone's experience. The first should not be replaced by hope for future appreciation, nor the second by financial or emotional bookkeeping. Care can be recognized as particular participation without calculating continual confirmation. It remains a human relationship in which things are measured differently and more than one person has a claim to tell what happened.

V. An undertaking continues under new conditions

An undertaking's legacy seems visible: a school operates, a book is read, a device is used. Yet a name and useful substance may diverge. An organization can retain its founder's portrait while losing attention to its intended participants. A smaller undertaking can contribute to something new after its name disappears. Longevity is therefore not the only question. What possibilities and demands remain, and who decides? Creators can explain purposes for discussion; successors can distinguish important reasons from outdated details. Future work inhabits future circumstances, not our present description of them.

Not everything useful should continue indefinitely. Work may have answered a particular need that no longer exists. Educational material may have become outdated. Participants may choose another path. Ending it is not always betrayal. Yet a convenient excuse must not be passed off as a tested reason: an undertaking sometimes ends because people stopped listening to those who still need it. Distinguishing the cases requires facts about present conditions, rather than reverence for the past or excitement about novelty alone. This gives no universal instruction to close or preserve an organization. For legacy, it is enough to recognize that living continuation includes assessment. Passing on the ability to assess is a different contribution from demanding duration and preservation of the same outward appearance regardless of what the work currently does.

Sometimes the most useful part of transmission is the ability to work without constant permission from a former leader. An understandable arrangement, an accessible history of decisions, and a recognized right to question help an undertaking stop depending on one person. This does not erase agreements, authorship, or particular restrictions. It changes the image of success: successors can investigate instead of merely guessing an absent person's wishes. A document alone cannot guarantee that capacity. Participation and checking understanding are needed. We can leave explanations and conditions of access, but cannot complete someone else's future learning for them. The legacy of work thus contains both an actual contribution and an actual limit. It is no way to remain the sole actor in work that others now do.

VI. Honest remembrance can hold a mixed account

Remembrance gravitates towards a finished portrait: someone was always generous, never retreated, helped everyone. Those words can exclude people who encountered another side. Keeping a particular memory requires no blanket exposure of good accounts as false; it means not substituting one account for all others. Name an act, time, and participant. Testimony remains meaningful without promising a complete biography. Different memories need examination rather than an automatic accusation of insult or untrustworthiness. Several parties can testify to a relationship, and its significance does not require their accounts to coincide completely.

It helps to distinguish a fact, one's impression, and a later interpretation. I saw the person stop to help; I felt supported; today I consider the incident important. These statements connect without being identical. Distinguishing them leaves room for clarification without making a personal memory insignificant. A story can mark what is unknown instead of confidently filling a gap. Descendants or learners then receive more than an attractive result: they receive a way to take responsibility for words. There is no duty to turn family remembrance into a scholarly archive. Even a short account, however, can avoid presenting a supposition as an established

event or assigning thoughts the person never expressed. Accuracy here serves the relationship rather than replacing it with a formal exercise.

Remembrance also has boundaries of access. Someone else's private letter, information about a conflict, or a story of vulnerability does not become common property merely because it helps explain a legacy. Before passing it on, we can distinguish our testimony from entrusted material. This article establishes no legal procedure for storage or publication; it asks that living participants remain in view. Sometimes preserving means keeping material within a small circle, removing identifying details, or asking for consent. Not every detail is necessary to understand what mattered. The right to remember is not a right to dispose of another person's entire life. With that distinction intact, a legacy can support conversation without making the next person an unwilling keeper of a secret or participant in a public dispute.

VII. A recipient need not become an extension of the giver

Giving can carry an unnoticed expected response: a book demands agreement, craft teaching demands a career, educational support demands a life modelled on the giver's. Contributions may matter while expectations require separate discussion. Receiving a possibility is not accepting every attached purpose. Gratitude differs from agreement. A learner can acknowledge good teaching and choose other work; a child can remember care and live differently. These choices are not invariably wise or faultless. They belong to the person living their consequences rather than to a portrait of the former giver.

In Dewey I.2, shared understanding differs from an arrangement in which people merely carry out commands. This offers limited support here: obedience alone cannot test the acceptance of a legacy. There needs to be room for a question and an answer, including disagreement. This does not make every agreement expire when participants change. Promises, authorship, and others' interests still need attention. Yet an unspoken demand to love what was received in exactly the same way should not become an obligation retrospectively. If a particular condition of a gift or undertaking matters to someone, they need to name it beforehand and allow refusal. Where there was no such opportunity, the convenient word “ingratitude” can conceal a lack of genuine agreement between the parties.

Recipients, too, can respond without a demonstrative rejection of everything earlier. Sometimes it is enough to explain what they preserve and what they change. Sometimes conversation is impossible, and a decision is made among remaining testimony and present conditions. An infallible imagined answer from an absent person is not needed as permission to live. It matters more not to assign them convenient agreement or use their name to end a dispute among the living. The next person's right to decide does not erase the history of receiving; that history does not erase their right. Legacy becomes a relationship between independent lives when both sides remain visible. The next generation's freedom deserves

fuller discussion elsewhere; here it is necessary to keep transmission itself from becoming possession.

VIII. A good name cannot justify a harmful trace

Legacy includes unresolved conflicts, unfair work, mistaken explanations, and objects that become burdens. A preserved name cannot correct these consequences; good acts elsewhere cannot erase them. What is available now may be addressed in part: clarify an error, complete a commitment, remove an unnecessary demand, or make room for another person. This does not produce a spotless portrait or guarantee reconciliation. Repentance needs separate consideration. Here it matters that an available change is not replaced by hope for sufficiently favourable remembrance. Correction has its own actual object.

Someone who received a harmful arrangement need not first make the past into an attractive whole before acting differently. They can acknowledge useful teaching and refuse humiliation, preserve a document and correct a mistaken practice. Mixed inheritance does not require indiscriminate acceptance. Conversely, rejecting one side does not prove that every other side was false. Precise distinctions help avoid both reverence and total erasure. They can remain difficult because living participants have different interests and memories. The article offers no compulsory reconciliation. A boundary can be maintained without completing a shared account. A new life need not become a court that waits indefinitely for figures from the past to authorize its next step, or mistakes that unresolved permission for the sole condition of action.

Sometimes an unfavourable legacy consists precisely in silence. People coming afterwards do not know why a decision was made, under which conditions work proceeds, or what was already promised to others. They have to guess while the creator assumes good intentions were enough to hand over. A small explanation may be more substantial here than a ceremonial declaration of values. It should communicate what is known, mark what is unknown, and promise no future entirely free of difficulty. Recipients still have the work of understanding, but need not also do unnecessary detective work. Every future conflict cannot be prevented. We can nevertheless avoid making our uncertainty an obligatory riddle for others. The outwardly modest contribution has a concrete object: reduce an available part of the confusion while it can still be explained.

IX. There is no duty to leave something great

Legacy can become another achievement demand: create important work, transmit unique experience, preserve family history, remember everyone. This obligatory list makes finite life insufficient beforehand. Distinguishing forms of legacy broadens attention rather than imposing a quantity. One person runs a large undertaking, another participates in a small one, another does necessary daily work. Capacities and conditions differ. Having no monument, children, learners, or property is not evidence of an empty life. Particular participation can be examined without assuming identical recipients or continuation, or requiring life to resemble another's visible achievement.

Declining a great project need not forbid attentiveness. One available act can be considered because it matters already: explain something useful, restore clarity to shared work, thank someone, or leave an understandable note. Not every act needs to be called a legacy while it occurs. The name can even get in the way by directing attention to one's own image rather than the other person's need. Understanding the object and limits of participation is enough. If help is unwanted, a record crosses someone else's boundary, or capacity is needed for urgent work, the possibility can be deferred or refused. A future bright trace receives no automatic right to cancel present consent. Participation is no less human because it was not designed for universal remembrance or attached to an ambitious account of its author.

Reflection on finitude does not require a hurried final version of oneself. Part of the story may remain unfinished and part of the experience untransmitted. This is a limit rather than a particular moral failure that always needs compensation. Circumstances can interrupt work too. Not every lost legacy results from its creator's insufficient effort. If something genuinely valuable occurred, failure to secure its eternal preservation does not retrospectively turn it into nothing. Other people's continuing lives are not entirely in our hands. This limits what we can promise while leaving participation possible. We can do an available part without requiring it to vindicate the entire biography we have lived, and without assessing ourselves through a future whose actual conditions and responses remain unknown to us.

X. A trace can continue without possession of the future

In IV.XXVIII of this edition, Marcus Aurelius contrasts fragile fame with just, truthful action. This Stoic self-address is no proof people need no recognition. The question shifts from lasting remembrance to present relationships. Preserving names remains possible without promising centuries of care's survival. A present act need not depend entirely on future renown. Someone can join an undertaking without knowing its final fate. Uncertainty does not empty participation; it limits honest guarantees about other people's future decisions, experiences, and conditions beyond our complete determination.

Legacy does not make a person an immortal administrator. Even when their words are read, each reader encounters them from a particular time and situation. Even when an undertaking continues, new participants act for themselves. A request, testimony, tool, or reason for a decision can be left, but their future lives cannot literally be lived for them. This requires no indifference to the quality of what is transmitted. On the contrary, the limit of control makes present clarity, accessibility, and honesty more important. Inability to correct everything later gives us no right to forbid others from correcting it. Finite transmission has room for one's own position and acknowledgment of another's action. Conviction about what matters need not present itself as the final will of human history.

Return to the fictional workshop. Its legacy can be seen in tools, explanations, people who learned, and a way of discussing mistakes. Its limits can be seen too: what remained unclear, who was not heard, and what needs changing. None of these views must become the craftsperson's final portrait. They let successors decide under actual conditions. In ordinary life as well, legacy becomes less grand in its promises and more definite in its substance. It includes remembrance, work, care, and everyday traces without demanding equal permanence from them all. The next person receives no unfinished duty to make us eternal. They receive an opportunity to encounter what we left and respond from their own life. That response remains their participation, with an actual history behind it and choices still ahead.

What this means in practice

Begin, if useful, with one thing received or to be passed on: a skill, explanation, form of participation, object, or memory. Name it precisely enough to distinguish it from a general wish to leave a good name. Who has access to it? What does that person actually receive, and what do you only hope to receive in return? The questions require neither immediate transmission nor a ceremonial conclusion.

Where there is a present recipient, you can ask whether the substance is understandable and wanted. Name accepted conditions separately from expectations that still belong only to you. Refusal, a different use, or a request for clarification does not automatically establish ingratitude. When remembering another person, distinguish your testimony, what is unknown, and entrusted information that should not be passed on without grounds.

Finally, consider one available part: explain something, correct confusion, preserve a precise acknowledgment, or avoid imposing something unnecessary. Doing nothing now remains an option if an act would be inappropriate. This reflection is no tested method and promises no relief, lasting remembrance, or successful continuation. It helps formulate a question about a particular relationship while leaving the next decision to its participants.

Key quotation

> *Consensus demands communication.*

— John Dewey, Democracy and Education I.2; original English.

Connections between traditions

1. **Usefulness and remembrance of a name.** Marcus Aurelius IV.XXVIII in the Casaubon edition turns from fragile fame towards present action; Ecclesiastes 9:15–16 portrays a wise person's forgotten contribution. The comparison separates contribution from recognition: absence of fame does not establish what an act gave others. The limit: Stoic self-address and a wisdom story about unjust recognition are no single doctrine; neither justifies erasing known authorship or guarantees a benefit's preservation.

2. **A received quality and social transmission.** Marcus Aurelius I.I–IV names people and received ways of learning and relating; Dewey I.1 considers transmitted experience necessary for social continuation. The shared mechanism concerns substance living through a participant able to receive it, beyond a surviving object. The limit: grateful personal remembrance differs from a philosophical account of social continuity; recipients do not become exact copies of mentors, and one influence explains no complete biography.

3. **A free response and shared understanding.** Marcus Aurelius I.III recalls accepting another's freedom of speech; Dewey I.2 distinguishes communication with shared understanding from command-following alone. The connection asks whether transmission allows a real question or demands obedience. The limit: a personal ethical example and educational theory have different tasks; room for disagreement does not remove the need to honour accepted commitments, preserve accurate authorship, or consider a decision's consequences.

4. **Continuing participation without a complete history of names.** Dewey I.1–2 connects social continuity with communicated experience; Ecclesiastes 9:13–18 distinguishes the wise man's act from his place in the city's remembrance. The mechanism reveals two possible traces: preserving a named author and using a received possibility. The limit: the story does not establish subsequent transmission of knowledge; Dewey's account guarantees neither survival, goodness, nor recognition of every contribution.

5. **Attentive reception and understandable transmission.** Marcus Aurelius I.IV recalls diligent reading rather than superficial assent; Dewey I.2 considers accurate communication attentive to another's understanding. Both concern the work of the two parties: passing on words does not by itself complete a legacy, and repeating them does not by itself complete reception. The

limit: these are distinct philosophical supports, not an efficacy study; attentive understanding retains checking and refusal without making every received judgment true.

Primary sources

1. **Marcus Aurelius.** Meditations, First Book I–IV and Fourth Book XXVIII using this edition's divisions. Meric Casaubon translation, Project Gutenberg ebook 2680. The complete selected passages and Notes opening were read: the English text was prepared by comparing editions of 1634 and 1635, with some changes, and is sometimes paraphrastic. Named personal debts and fame/action distinctions are used; surrounding historical judgments and Stoic fate are not universalized.

2. **John Dewey.** Democracy and Education, Chapter I sections 1–2. Original English text, Project Gutenberg ebook 852. Complete selected sections on transmitted experience, communication, and shared understanding were read. This is philosophical educational theory, not a current efficacy study of particular transmission methods; historical cultural hierarchies are not adopted.

3. **Ecclesiastes.** 9:13–18; epigraph from 9:15. King James Version, Bible Gateway. The full selected context of a wise person's forgotten contribution is used. The wisdom story is no verified biography and guarantees no inevitable recognition or preservation of every benefit.

Displayed Russian quotations are United Wisdom's own translations from the named English sources. The fictional workshop and suggested questions are original examples; the cited texts establish no efficacy for the reflection.

Tags

legacy, memory, fame, care, undertaking, continuity, transmission, communication, consent, gratitude, Marcus Aurelius, Dewey, Ecclesiastes, finitude, name, authorship, teacher, learner, relationships, responsibility, freedom, recipient, generation, experience, work, consequences, correction, participation, meaning, life path

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.