

UNITED WISDOM

Early Success and the Fear of Not Repeating It

Meaning and Direction

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

P-09-N01 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Early Success and the Fear of Not Repeating It

Epigraph

> *It is better to leave a vessel unfilled, than to attempt to carry it when it is full.*

— Tao Teh King 9.1, complete sentence; James Legge’s English translation.

What this article is about

An early conspicuous success can open possibilities while placing someone under a strange demand: now they must prove again that the previous result was deserved. This essay considers that situation, not an age pattern. Early here means success arriving before someone has developed a settled relationship to their work; no particular age is compulsory. Through an invented young writer’s example, we distinguish the quality of work, recognition by others, and predictions about later results. We turn to selected passages from Epictetus, the Tao Teh King, and Ecclesiastes while preserving their different grounds. These texts provide neither a recipe for winning again nor an explanation of every successful person’s condition. They help frame more definite questions: what exactly should be repeated, which conditions have changed, and what will the next work serve if its reception differs? Fear need not disappear before action begins, and a new result need not confirm an entire earlier biography.

I. Recognition Is Not a Contract with the Future

Imagine Nikita, now twenty-eight. At twenty-five his first story collection received a small literary prize and several attentive reviews. This is an invented example, not a real writer’s history or a typical generational fate. The award was a definite event: certain people read the book and considered it worthy of recognition. Now Nikita is working on another book and quietly treats the earlier event as a promise. He thinks a good second text ought to produce a similar response; otherwise the first success will turn out to have meant nothing. Yet the jury’s previous decision contained no such obligation and supplied no precise knowledge about the future.

Joy in the award can remain while this additional contract is relinquished. That does not depreciate the work or declare recognition an accidental mistake. It simply restores the event to its actual scale. The collection existed, readers responded, and a decision was made in particular circumstances. The next book requires fresh consideration. There is no need to comfort Nikita by promising that genuine talent always finds recognition. We have no such

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

promise. In this invented situation, it is more useful to ask which part of the past he carries forward: acquired skill, interest in writing, hope for readers, or an obligatory repeat of the ceremony. Those subjects are related without constituting the same demand on a new book.

Fear can concern the loss of different things. Nikita may fear a weak text, diminished attention, disappointing people close to him, or losing his own confidence. Calling everything failure is convenient but insufficiently precise. A weakness in the text permits editorial work; another person’s response cannot be prescribed beforehand; a conversation with family requires a different action. These distinctions are proposed for our example, not as a universal classification of feelings. They guarantee no relief. Their purpose is to avoid commissioning a manuscript to repair an artistic weakness, secure a public victory, and prove someone’s right to remain themselves simultaneously. That combined commission greatly exceeds what a definite text can actually accomplish.

II. An Early Result Can Become a Personal Calendar

Nikita remembers not only the prize but the age at which he received it. A personal timetable is easy to construct from there: if the first award came at twenty-five, another, more prominent one should arrive by thirty. The timetable appears personal while incorporating other people’s ideas about growth and sequence. Someone can sincerely want development while accepting an unsupported formula that development must appear as increasing attention at regular intervals. This essay establishes no frequency for that experience. We consider the particular passage from one event to the expectation of an entire line. The first achievement becomes not a memory and resource but the starting point of a graph that must never be left.

Distinguish an actual deadline from an age promise. If Nikita agreed to deliver a manuscript to a publisher by a certain date, a definite commitment needs consideration. A birthday itself, however, establishes neither a book’s artistic quality nor a future jury’s decision. Changing a date by agreement is not proof of lost ability. Equally, wanting freedom from comparison does not cancel an actual promise to a publisher. Examining the calendar requires naming who expects what and on which grounds. One expectation arose from an agreement, another from somebody’s remark, and a third from a personal habit of measuring growth through prizes. These expectations cannot all be treated in exactly the same way.

Early success need not make every later part of life early. A writer may quickly receive recognition for one text and spend a long time learning another form. That is a possibility in our example, not a prediction of the correct path. A later work is not automatically more mature, just as a quickly completed one is not automatically superficial. Age alone does not settle the matter. Nikita can examine what requires time in the present project: narrative construction, knowledge of its material, discussion with an editor, or repeated attempts to anticipate reviews. That question is more precise than the demand to move quickly enough. It considers

actual working conditions without turning every date into an examination of continuing personal worth.

III. One’s Action and Recognition Have Different Conditions

In Epictetus’ Enchiridion, §§1 and 19, Thomas Wentworth Higginson’s translation in the displayed edition, one’s choice differs from external standing; honours do not certify happiness. This is a demanding Stoic position. We present it neither as modern psychological law nor as a promise of complete invulnerability for readers. The adopted question is limited: which action am I choosing, and which external response am I expecting?

Nikita can choose to work on a scene, consult an editor, or check an important detail. Those actions also depend on conditions: time, access to material, and another person’s participation. The entire process should not be described as wholly within his power. Yet intending to write more precisely differs from requiring a reader to experience a prescribed impression. The former permits examination of his decisions; the latter includes another person’s response. Joining them makes every editorial action seem insufficient until praise arrives. Revision then addresses not a definite weakness but an imagined final confirmation. No correction can establish in advance every future response from different readers.

Recognition does not thereby become meaningless. A review may offer a precise observation, open a conversation, or affect opportunities for another publication. Everything external need not be declared irrelevant in order to name limits of control. Nikita can want attentive readers while acknowledging that he cannot prescribe their number. He can consider publication conditions without promising himself a reward for foresight. The Stoic distinction is used here to question the structure of an expectation, not to require an end to needing others. Responsibility to participants remains when work is shared. Dependence is not always humiliation, and considering another person’s response does not always mean surrendering independent judgment.

IV. Praise Can Become Something That Must Be Guarded Continuously

In the Tao Teh King, chapters 9 and 13, James Legge’s translation, honour is connected with apprehension of loss, and completed work with a limit to retaining success. Its horizon is Tao and Heaven, not a theory of modern careers. The selected images permit a question about relating to achievement. They do not oblige readers to abandon a profession or disappear after a first award.

Nikita scarcely returns to the ceremony itself. He guards its imagined continuation. Every new story is mentally compared with the image of someone already praised. Even rest seems

suspicious: another writer might become more visible meanwhile. This mechanism belongs to the invented scene; it is not attributed to everyone who receives an award. The question is what supports an action: interest in the text or an attempt to avoid any reduction in previous attention. Both motives may coexist. There is no need to acquire pure motivation entirely without a wish for recognition first. Notice where guarding an earlier image dictates a decision, and examine whether that decision suits the present work.

A limit to holding on does not mean every achieved position must immediately be abandoned. Nikita may have actual reasons to maintain a publisher relationship and participate in literary life. Declining a public appearance also has consequences that deserve consideration. The proposed question does not replace examining those conditions. It distinguishes preserving an opportunity to work from endlessly prolonging the victorious moment. Our writer can thank people for earlier recognition, accept one invitation, and decline another without declaring awards harmful in general. Proportion concerns a definite action. One ancient image cannot determine it as though that image already understood every contemporary professional relationship.

V. Effort Contains No Guarantee of an Outcome

In Ecclesiastes 9:10–12, King James Version, an exhortation to work accompanies limits of knowledge and unpredictable outcomes. The read context 9:1–9 retains God, mortality, and enjoyment of life. This religious text becomes neither a secular promise of good fortune nor an explanation of every failure. The distinction relevant here is limited: active participation does not certify future victory.

Nikita can put effort into the next book without treating every additional week as a guarantee of better reception. This does not mean labour has no effect on a text or that chance decides everything. Improved structure may genuinely change his manuscript’s quality while the jury’s decision remains a separate event. Influence differs substantially from guarantee. Without that distinction, someone first attributes complete control of success to themselves and then takes an absent award as proof of a complete personal deficiency. This essay assesses no actual book by a single sign. A weak text, inattentive reception, or a combination of insufficiently understood circumstances all remain possible.

The distinction promises no easy response to lost attention. A writer may feel disappointment and want another result. Disappointment need not be declared wisdom merely because it occurred. Nikita can acknowledge an unsuccessful reception and separately examine what is known about the book. A review identifying a definite weakness provides material for work. A comparison with earlier success alone supplies insufficient grounds for a complete assessment. Acknowledging limits of knowledge leaves part of the question open instead of immediately explaining everything favourably. An unsuccessful outcome may have actual

consequences without becoming a final answer about every subsequent work or the entire person.

VI. What Should Be Repeated Is Not Always the Same Thing

Repeating success conceals several different assignments. Nikita may want to write vivid stories again, receive another prize, sell a certain number of books again, or regain confidence at a reader meeting. None of those wishes is inherently prohibited. They require different conditions, however, and cannot be tested by one indicator. More precise work may receive less public attention. Interest may arise through circumstances that say little about each story's quality. The important question is which assignment belongs to the present manuscript. Otherwise every achievement will be cancelled because one of the other desired signs did not arrive alongside it.

The next book may also be a different undertaking. Familiar material supported the first collection; now Nikita tries a more complex form and needs to learn. A previous result does not require him already to know what he has not worked with. Equally, novelty does not make something good merely by distinguishing it from the old. An editor may reasonably identify a weak scene and propose revision. Rejecting an obligatory repeat of the prize does not remove the need to consider that observation. Both limits remain: a new undertaking has its own conditions without becoming exempt from assessment of its content. Distinguishing tasks serves precision rather than a convenient explanation for every weakness.

A provisional criterion can be framed without replacing the whole book with a number. Nikita might want a character's action to become understandable within a scene rather than through a later explanatory insertion. That is a definite artistic question suitable for discussion with an editor. Resolving it guarantees no success for the entire work but permits examination of one part. Another writer will choose a different question. The example is no universal writing method. What matters is a criterion concerning the actual subject of work and remaining open to refinement. An earlier prize may support willingness to work without becoming the sole measure of every subsequent decision's quality.

VII. A Response Need Not Become a Trial of a Biography

An acquaintance tells Nikita that the second collection must demonstrate genuine development. The remark may express sincere hope for a good book while establishing no precise criterion. The writer can ask what development means here: another conception, more precise language, or a more prominent award. This is no requirement to justify himself to every passer-by. Clarification matters where a worthwhile conversation exists. Sometimes an answer reveals an expectation about the image of success rather than the text. Sometimes it names an actual weakness deserving consideration. Whether a response pleases the writer cannot determine that distinction in advance; a substantial observation may be unpleasant and still useful.

Responsibility to collaborators differs from an obligation to preserve their enthusiasm. If a publisher relied on an agreed deadline or an editor reserved time, Nikita must consider those commitments. They cannot simply be declared external judgments so that participation becomes unnecessary. Yet previous praise from a publisher does not enable him to ensure equal pleasure in every new book. He can explain a changed conception, discuss an actual deadline, and consider definite criticism. He need not promise an emotional result beyond his control. This boundary preserves relationships and independence: another person may make their own assessment, while Nikita decides about the text with regard to accepted responsibility rather than obligatory reproduction of someone’s admiration.

Responses need not be collected endlessly. Nikita can choose a conversation with an editor about a definite question without turning every incidental remark into another assignment. This selects a discussion’s scale; it is no rule for avoiding criticism. Significant evidence of an error cannot be dismissed merely because the circle of discussion was already chosen. Equally, different people may hold incompatible preferences. A manuscript need not satisfy all of them simultaneously. The writer considers reasons rather than simply counting approving voices. This guarantees no correct decision but distinguishes examining content from trying to obtain final permission to continue living only after everyone agrees.

VIII. An Initial Success Can Be Examined without Unmasking Oneself

Nikita can examine the first collection without choosing between two extreme accounts. In one, he was uniquely gifted and must repeat everything; in the other, he merely got lucky and an absence of ability will now be exposed. Both accounts may exceed the available information. His text involved work, editorial help, a jury's decision, and a particular publication moment. Naming several conditions does not remove his participation or attribute the entire result to him. An honest description may contain mixed grounds: effort made, help received, a fortunate coincidence, and something still unknown. The unknown need not be filled with either flattery or an accusation of pretence.

Examination may provide material for the next work. Nikita recalls that reading aloud attentively helped him notice an awkward transition. That is his assessment of a particular experience, not a technique proven for every writer. He can try it again without expecting the old award as its compulsory result. Editorial help may also continue if conditions permit. Some circumstances cannot be reproduced: the jury's composition, that moment's reader interest, or a meeting with a particular reviewer. The past should not become a universal victory formula. A particular working approach may suit the next text while the entire successful situation remains in the past. A repeatable approach and an unrepeatable event occupy different levels of consideration.

The examination need not yield a precise share of merit and chance. We may lack information for that calculation. Nikita can thank his editor, name his own work, and acknowledge unknown conditions without assigning success arithmetically. He may also notice a weakness in the first collection that he understands better now. That does not cancel its earlier significance. Seeing past work more precisely need not make earlier praise false; it may mean his question has changed. A changed question guarantees no superiority for the new book. Examination keeps the present undertaking open: what experience is worth using, what requires refinement, and what should no longer be treated as a compulsory condition for the right to work.

IX. The Next Step Need Not Win an Entire Life in Advance

Nikita can choose one next subject: rewrite a scene and discuss whether its character's action is understandable. That subject is bounded without being declared safe or necessarily useful. The conversation may yield no clear answer, and revision may require another attempt. Still, the assignment differs from proving the first success was not accidental. It concerns a definite text whose result can be examined through a named question. Fear may remain alongside it. Calm need not be achieved first for action to count as real. Equally, this essay does not prescribe working through every condition. Actual workload and available circumstances remain part of the decision, rather than obstacles that must be denied.

A step's scale does not cancel larger questions. Nikita may want to keep writing while doubting its possibility under chosen conditions. Those questions require separate examination; one successful scene cannot settle them. The scene equally need not answer them all. A modest action is sometimes assigned too much and then declared useless because it failed to change an entire biography. Nikita can name the discussion's limit beforehand: the editor considers a character's action rather than finally determining his ability to live through writing. Another important question can be recorded separately. Distinguishing scales preserves the task's seriousness without turning a limited result into a fresh accusation against the person.

After discussion, examine grounds as well as an assessment. What became clearer? Which observation is supported by the text? Where do the participants still disagree? These belong to a proposed exercise, not research with established efficacy. They require no necessary improvement in feelings. Nikita may finish still worried while learning something definite about the scene, or he may gain no such knowledge. An open question then remains open without proving every later work impossible. A philosophical essay does not replace suitable assistance for a prolonged difficult condition. We consider relations among action and assessment, offering neither a diagnosis, treatment, nor a promise to remove fear of another unsuccessful outcome.

X. Continuing Need Not Mean Reaching the Same Peak

The first success can remain important without becoming a compulsory highest point or the eternal beginning of an ascending line. Nikita does not yet know what the next book will be or how his participation in writing will change. That lack of knowledge need not be filled with a promise of a greater future prize. Such comfort would preserve the old demand while merely postponing its deadline. Less can be said more precisely: a definite undertaking still matters to him, some conditions are available, and others require clarification. That guarantees no lifelong career. It permits consideration of the present task without advance proof of an entire future trajectory, unavailable from one past event or one present intention.

Something a person wanted to preserve may also be lost. A new book may receive less attention, relationships may change, and an earlier self-description may no longer fit. Every loss need not be called a beneficial step. Regret can coexist with precise consideration. Nikita can say he wanted a different reception without cancelling his work solely because expectation and outcome diverged. He may also acknowledge that substantial revision is necessary. Those responses are compatible with self-respect while differing in content. This essay chooses no convenient answer beforehand. It permits attention to an actual result, requiring neither victory nor heroic acceptance of every disappointment as a gift.

The next work is not another trial of the first success's right to exist. The past event happened and may remain valuable. Present action requires its own conditions, while a future response remains partly unknown. Nikita stops asking the second book to award him the first prize again. He considers text, commitments, and limits of knowledge separately without promising himself calm or victory. Another person's work will concern a different subject. The essay's general question is modest: can meaningful work continue with precise demands placed upon it when recognition need not repeat itself? An answer takes the form of a definite decision about action, responsibility, and uncertainty that the decision does not eliminate, rather than a guarantee.

What this means in practice

Choose one early success if this question is relevant. Name the event without a general verdict about yourself: what was done, who responded, and which decision was made. Record separately the expectation now appearing compulsory. Joy need not be exposed as false, and your percentage share of the result need not be calculated. Distinguish what happened from the prediction subsequently attached to it.

Clarify what should be repeated: a definite quality of work, a public response, an opportunity to continue, or confidence. Those wishes can remain without having identical conditions. Name an actual commitment to another person if one exists. Distinguish it from an age date, habitual comparison, and hope of preserving earlier praise.

Choose one subject for the next work and one question through which it can be considered. Name necessary conditions and the examination's limit. Who can provide a substantial response? What could it teach you, and what will the conversation leave unsettled? A modest step is declared neither safe, effective, nor sufficient for everyone; its consequences also need consideration.

After acting, compare grounds as well as the assessment received. What is supported, what changed, and what remains unknown? An open question, another outcome, or an acknowledged weakness are permissible. The exercise guarantees neither clarity, calm, nor

repeated success and does not replace appropriate assistance for a difficult condition. An earlier achievement need not disappear because the present result differs.

Key quotation

> *Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might;*

— Ecclesiastes 9:10, opening clause of the verse; King James Version.

Connections between traditions

1. **Who owns the demand to preserve praise?** Enchiridion 1 distinguishes one's choice from reputation; Tao Teh King 13.1–2 connects honour with apprehension of its loss. Their shared subject is expectation's dependence on external standing: recognition becomes a condition that must be retained continuously. This distinguishes work on a book from guarding the earlier image of a successful writer. The boundary is exact: Stoic grounds concern one's own and others' affairs in moral choice; the Taoist passage includes embodiment and rule in 13.3. They are not one theory of self-esteem, and neither proves that every award recipient should abandon recognition.

2. **Do honours certify a finished person?** Enchiridion 19 does not derive happiness from high standing; Tao Teh King 9.2 limits holding completed success within Heaven's horizon. They share a refusal to make a visible sign sufficient grounds for an entire life. Nikita's earlier prize can remain a fact without becoming an eternal personal certificate. The difference remains: Epictetus questions good and freedom, while the Taoist text concerns proportion in relating to achievement. No general ban on awards or obligatory end to a profession follows. Contemporary application requires its own conditions rather than reproducing either ancient norm in full.

3. **Does ability guarantee victory?** Ecclesiastes 9:11 distinguishes strength from a contest's outcome; Enchiridion 1 distinguishes one's action from external subjects. The shared mechanism is a gap between participation and an entire result that cannot be attributed wholly to intention. This separates possible improvement of a book from an obligatory second prize. The boundary remains: the biblical passage belongs to God and mortality's context 9:1–10, the Stoic one to moral choice. Neither studies literary awards. We promise neither complete access to all working conditions nor an explanation of every result exclusively through chance.

4. **Must effort continue without a limit?** Ecclesiastes 9:10's exhortation to work is compared with the unfilled vessel in Tao Teh King 9.1. The shared question concerns participation and proportion: work and its limit need not destroy each other. Here it permits examination of a second book's workload without endless increase for guaranteed victory. Their difference remains: the biblical exhortation concerns life's finitude, the Taoist image retention and

overfilling. A vessel supplies no medical workload standard, and the verse requires no work through every difficult condition. This distinction is an editorial application promising no outcome.

5. **Can success's future preservation be ensured?** Ecclesiastes 9:12 limits knowledge of one's time; Tao Teh King 13.2 considers apprehension of losing acquired honour. The comparison concerns a future turned into present obligation: anticipated loss can dictate work without ensuring an outcome. Nikita can question the difference between preparing a text and trying permanently to remove another possible reception. The boundary matters: biblical suddenness concerns human finitude, while the Taoist account concerns standing and bodily vulnerability, followed by government in 13.3. They become neither one psychological cause of fear nor grounds for therapeutic efficacy through resemblance.

Primary sources

Selected passages were read in the identified English editions; Russian quotations are United Wisdom's own translations from them. No Greek, Chinese, or Hebrew original was collated. Limited comparisons preserve different grounds.

• Epictetus, Enchiridion, §§1 and 19; Thomas Wentworth Higginson, displayed 1955 edition. Albert Salomon's introduction is not attributed to Epictetus. No direct quotation.

• Tao Teh King, complete chapters 9 and 13; James Legge. The displayed heading establishes no printed edition date. Epigraph: 9.1.

• Ecclesiastes 9:1–12, KJV, context 1–9 and selected 10–12. The key quotation opens 9:10. Its religious horizon remains.

The writer's example is invented; no exercise efficacy is established here. Historical editions' rights and a Public Domain label have territorial limits; no universal permission for raw import or vectorization is asserted.

Tags

early success, fear of repetition, recognition, award, first book, next work, age calendar, personal timetable, expectations, responsibility, commitment, uncertainty, text quality, editorial conversation, criticism, independent judgment, experience, assistance, working conditions, influence and guarantee, Epictetus, Enchiridion, Tao Teh King, James Legge, Ecclesiastes, proportion, gratitude, open question, continuing work, United Wisdom

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.