

UNITED WISDOM

Do Not Name a New Stage Before It Has Taken Shape

Meaning and Direction

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

P-10-N01 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Do Not Name a New Stage Before It Has Taken Shape

Epigraph

> *a time to keep silence, and a time to speak;*

Ecclesiastes 3:7, exact lowercase fragment from the latter portion, King James Version. The biblical image is not a rule to postpone necessary communication.

What this article is about

Change sometimes begins before a name for it has been found. A person tries a different activity, speaks differently with those close to them, or reconsiders an earlier plan without knowing whether to call this a new profession, way of life, or stage. The wish to name it is understandable: a word helps us communicate and see a direction. Yet an early label may add commitments never accepted and expectations other people already begin to form. This article examines how to describe a transition accurately while leaving its unfinished character visible. It offers no universal sequence of life stages and does not demand secrecy about important changes. References to the Tao Teh King, Analects, and Ecclesiastes distinguish a name's limits, responsibility in speech, and the timing of speaking, while preserving their different foundations. What can be reported as an actual step, what remains inquiry, and which shared consequences already need clarity?

I. Change can begin without a final name

Consider an invented example. Someone has been drawing for several months, shows their work to friends for the first time, and receives an invitation to a small exhibition. They are asked whether they have now become an artist. The answer seems larger than the question: they apparently need to declare who they are, how they will earn a living, and what will happen to their existing work. More modest things are already known: they draw, have prepared several pieces, and are considering a particular invitation. Those facts do not devalue the activity. They simply do not establish what remains unsettled. A precise description of the step can allow a freer conversation than a new role that immediately needs defending.

A name performs several different tasks. It can identify an activity for convenience, express a personal relation to it, communicate a status, or promise availability to others. The same word is used in all these ways, so misunderstanding can arise without an intention to deceive. Someone speaks about an interest while the listener hears an offer of a service. Someone

describes the possibility of moving while those close to them understand that a decision has been made. Before seeking a perfect name, clarify what the statement needs to do. What does this listener need to know, and which action depends on it? Naming then becomes a question of sufficient clarity rather than compressing an entire new life into one word.

An unfinished transition is not entirely shapeless. It may contain real elements: new time devoted to an activity, a changed responsibility, a first conversation, participation that has ended, or an offer not yet accepted. These can be named separately without asserting that they have formed a stable stage. In a month, some may remain, others change, and another disappear. A present description answers for what is known now, not everlasting loyalty to a future conclusion. This leaves room for inquiry while preserving responsibility towards people who need particular facts. A cautious name is honest when the caution does not conceal consequences that have already arisen.

II. Interest, a step, and a status describe different things

Interest tells us where attention is directed. A completed step tells us what happened. A status usually indicates how participation is recognised in a particular setting. These may be connected without one automatically establishing another. Reading a book is not accepting a teaching; meeting a team is not appointment to a role; wanting to teach does not establish readiness to take responsibility for a particular course. This is no general prohibition on a new name. It is a need to understand the content assigned to it. If a term implies qualifications, authority, or a promised service, those grounds need separate clarification. A personal sense of significance does not replace conditions on which other people’s participation depends.

Return to the invented exhibition. You can say that you have prepared work and are discussing participation. That is accurate even without a professional self-description. You can say that you now accept commissions for a particular kind of drawing if the offer is genuine and its conditions understood. But a sentence about a new activity alone does not establish dates, capabilities, or the limits of a service. The listener needs more than a name: they need to know what they can count on. Distinguishing these elements avoids announcing more than exists or hiding what exists because you feel required to produce a whole professional biography. Between them lies concrete participation.

An inward change can also be described without a total status. You might be noticing more carefully what you agree to, finding an earlier distribution of time unsuitable, or exploring different questions. Such statements do not prove a completed transformation. They identify an observation or intention that will still meet action. If someone announces themselves entirely new, the next ordinary mistake may seem to destroy the whole transition. More precise speech leaves room for imperfect participation and correction. It relates change to a particular

area without making the rest of the person an obsolete version that must immediately be discarded. New participation can grow from earlier experience without erasing it.

III. A working description permits truthful speech now

A working description differs from a vague promise. It distinguishes an action, a condition, and what remains unknown. You might be joining an introductory meeting and deciding afterwards whether regular participation suits you. That makes clear what is happening and what has not been accepted. A declaration of a new stage might sound more expressive while leaving greater room for a mistaken conclusion. A working description need not be dry. Joy, interest, and the event’s importance can be expressed as your response. That response does not become an agreement with the future. You can take an attempt seriously without claiming that its place in your whole life is settled permanently.

Words such as for now, trying, discussing, and not yet knowing help only when they refer to an actual boundary. They cannot cancel a promise already made. If you accepted a particular date, an exploratory period does not make that date optional. If a change affects shared expenses, calling it an experiment does not remove the need to discuss them. A working description can therefore be checked from two sides: is it accurate for you and clear enough for someone whose plans are affected? Sometimes one more sentence is needed: you are exploring another possibility while retaining this week’s commitment, or earlier participation is no longer possible and its change needs separate discussion.

Clarification also helps when someone else interprets a change too quickly. A listener may call it a move, a withdrawal, a new profession, or a final separation before you do. You need not debate every meaning of their term. Return to what is known: this has changed, this has been agreed, and this remains open. You do not have to make them accept your entire self-description. You need to identify the actual action being discussed. Their assessment may nevertheless contain an important observation about consequences you missed. Working language allows you to hear it without immediately adopting the whole label: a specific effect deserves examination even where the larger name remains disputed.

IV. A name does not exhaust what is happening

Chapter 1 of the Tao Teh King, in James Legge's translation, distinguishes a name that can be named from the enduring name. It concerns the Tao, naming, and the origin of things. It neither describes modern career stages nor establishes that every self-description is false. A limited comparison concerns our question: a word may identify what is happening without containing its entire substance. Naming an activity does not enumerate its conditions, meaning, or future forms. Naming a transition does not provide full knowledge of its course. Language can remain useful without requiring one term to settle every question permanently. This application belongs to the article, with the text's Daoist foundation retained separately.

This does not mean that nothing should be named. An indefinite statement can obstruct understanding as much as an overconfident label. If someone needs practical help, saying that they are undergoing a mysterious transition does not show what would help. If participation in a project changes, an attractive account of an inward journey does not replace clarity about the work. A name is useful insofar as it lets others understand the relevant part of the situation. An ordinary verb may be sufficient: studying, stopping, postponing, agreeing, or discussing. A verb identifies action without turning it into an eternal essence. It still needs precision: discussing a possibility and confirming participation are different actions.

A name's limits also prevent it from governing every later decision. Calling yourself an explorer of a new field does not oblige you to accept every invitation within it. Acknowledging a changed relation to work does not require leaving immediately. Each action has conditions of its own. Self-description can support coherence without becoming automatic justification for a step. You can ask whether you agree because you understand the proposal or because you feel obliged to match a label. That question does not prohibit commitments. It restores the possibility of accepting them for their content rather than to defend a word that was convenient at an earlier point.

V. Responsibility in speech remains without a large label

In Analects XIII.3, the discussion of rectifying names arises in relation to government. Confucius connects accurate language with conducting affairs, then with ritual, music, and punishments. That historical political and ethical setting cannot be transferred directly to a personal transition. Yet the connection between speech and action offers another comparative ground: words affect what people expect to undertake together. Avoiding a premature label therefore does not license inaccurate communication. If a word conveys participation, a listener may plan on that basis. Responsibility concerns the statement's relation to what exists and the possibility of carrying it out, rather than the grandeur of a new role.

In V.5 of the same work, Confucius proposes that Ch'i-tiao K'ai take official employment. The pupil replies that he cannot yet rest in assurance, and the Master is pleased. The brief episode gives no modern qualification procedure. It presents an answer stating a limit of confidence. For this article, the point is that such a limit can be spoken without self-condemnation or a final rejection of the activity. Between naming an interest and accepting a role lies the question of particular consent. A participant today can clarify requirements, the extent of responsibility, and conditions for beginning. Those actions are not literal deductions from the ancient dialogue; they distinguish acknowledged uncertainty from having no possibilities at all.

These passages should not be smoothed into general advice to delay. Rectifying names requires clarity, while the pupil's answer identifies readiness not yet accepted. Together, they retain a tension: do not announce the unsettled as settled, and do not conceal settled facts in attractive uncertainty. A conversation about a new stage can state what has changed, which participation remains, and which question is still open. If others need a date or confirmation of an action, a large self-description does not answer them. You may not know what your activity will be called in a year while knowing whether you can fulfil tomorrow's agreement. That local clarity is serious enough in its own right.

VI. Different listeners need different sufficient clarity

Not every change requires an immediate public announcement. A person can read, try something, keep private notes, and talk with a chosen listener before deciding what to share more widely. A private area of inquiry matters. It differs, however, from information needed by people participating in shared life. If someone bears expenses or relies on your presence, consequences of the transition already belong to the common situation. You can retain privacy about every feeling while communicating availability, a date, or a changed responsibility. Sufficient clarity depends on what meaningful participation requires, rather than another person's right to know everything. The distinction preserves both personal boundaries and actual relationships.

In an invented example, someone on a shared project explores other work. They need not report every opportunity they read about to the team. But accepting a meeting that affects an agreed date requires discussion of that date. They can say that they will be absent on Thursday and propose a way to hand over the task. This does not settle their entire future role. The team receives relevant information without the personal inquiry becoming a public report. If a change becomes sustained and affects general availability, the necessary communication also changes. Accurate speech follows actual consequences rather than a wish to prove that the transition has finally acquired an attractive form.

Different audiences also matter in friendly questions. One person wants to know how to introduce you, another to support a conversation, and another to arrange work. Everyone need

not receive the same large explanation. You can choose a sufficient sentence for each question: this is what you do now, this remains exploration, or this participation is available for discussion. If you add a personal story, it remains your story rather than evidence of a completed stage. A listener may not share your chosen label without preventing a clear agreement. What matters is that your words do not reasonably invite expectations of something you are not offering. A small accurate statement may preserve relations better than a sweeping declaration of change.

VII. A small involvement needs no complete new biography

Sometimes a new name is sought because taking a step without it seems impossible. Before attending an activity, a person wants to determine whether they belong to that circle; before offering a drawing, they want to settle who they have become. Yet a particular step can have clear conditions without final self-definition. You can learn the format, agree on limited participation, do the available work, and then examine the result. Regular attendance need not be promised if it has not been accepted. A smaller involvement is not necessarily unserious. Seriousness appears in understanding and fulfilling what was chosen, rather than in the size of the story told before beginning.

The boundary of exploratory participation must also be clear to the other side. If someone regards a meeting as an introduction while the organiser regards it as the beginning of a compulsory course, the word trying is insufficient. The difference needs clarification before further plans rest on it. This concerns conditions, not the authenticity of an intention. You can want to learn without accepting the proposed extent of commitment, and choose another format after a meeting. An agreement actually fulfilled nevertheless remains real. Participation does not become nonexistent because a larger stage failed to form. It can be considered on its own terms without making every attempt entry into a permanent identity.

Participation can provide information without immediately providing a name. After a first event, requirements, available possibilities, or interest in continuing may become clearer. Sometimes only the unsuitability of that format becomes clear. Either result permits an updated description: this is now known, this action was completed, and the next remains unaccepted. Words follow experience rather than requiring it to confirm a previously chosen signboard. If you wish to continue, identify grounds for continuation. If you wish to stop, identify the boundary of the particular attempt. That is more accurate than concluding that every possible path is closed or every future form already discovered.

VIII. Earlier experience does not disappear with a new name

A transition is sometimes narrated as a complete break: the person used to be one thing and has become something entirely different. The form can be expressive while concealing actual continuity. A new activity uses earlier skills, relationships, and limits. A new understanding emerged in conversations that remain part of life. Difference can be recognised without declaring the past mistaken preparation. In an invented example, someone changes fields while retaining the ability to organise meetings and explain complex matters. These capacities need not receive an old or new ideological name. They operate in a particular situation and show what was carried into the transition and what requires further learning.

Continuity also concerns commitments. Announcing a new stage does not automatically rewrite earlier promises. Some remain, others need reconsideration, and others have ended. They need to be seen individually. If an earlier commitment can no longer be fulfilled, its consequences and an available handover require a specific conversation rather than an appeal to being a different person now. If the promise remains valid, a new self-description can coexist with it. Language clarifies a shared history: what was done, what remains, and what changes. It does not grant a newly described person the right to begin relationships afresh without the other side’s participation.

Ecclesiastes 3 places its sequence of different times beside a limit on human knowledge of God’s work from beginning to end. This biblical frame provides no timetable of stages for every biography. A limited comparison lets the present point remain less than a complete explanation of the whole course. Today’s name may matter without supplying the final meaning of every earlier event. You can reconsider your account while retaining known facts and other people’s participation. If part of the past remains difficult to understand, that question can stay open. New coherence need not immediately make the whole history convenient and unambiguous. An accurate story can include something for which sufficient explanation has not yet been found.

IX. When a name acquires sufficient grounds

Caution does not impose a permanent prohibition on a new name. Actions may have accumulated, conditions become clearer, participants confirmed an agreement, and you understand what the word means. A name can then assist communication. Sufficient grounds depend on its task. Describing a personal interest requires different information from offering a service, holding an office, or joining an institution. There is no single inward mark after which all labels become correct. Ask instead what the word conveys in this setting and whether that content is established. The question permits a name without requiring it to explain every part of the person or guarantee an unchanging future.

A word can be accepted together with a limit. Within this project you may be responsible for specified work; a particular field may have become a regular activity; or you may be ready to present these pieces under a chosen description. A limit does not weaken acknowledgment. It explains its scope. You can be confident in a particular role while exploring its longer-term place in life, or maintain a regular practice without knowing whether it will become your main work. When a name is connected with precise content, it does not require continually expanding responsibilities to match it. It can support a conversation while leaving the next step to a separate agreement.

An accepted name can also need clarification. Conditions, an activity’s meaning, or a shared agreement change, and an earlier word may become inaccurate. Reconsidering it does not necessarily mean its first use was a lie; it may have fitted that situation. Distinguish honest revision from concealing an error. If you claimed more than you knew, identify that excess. If circumstances changed later, identify the change. This retains history without making every earlier formulation permanent. A name helps while it clarifies actual participation. When it obstructs that understanding, precision can be sought again without erasing what was done or appropriating someone else’s consent.

X. Incompleteness can be communicated without an excuse

Saying that you do not yet know what to call something may feel like admitting failure. A serious change seems obliged to arrive with a confident story. But a clear account and a final name are different results. You can understand today’s step reasonably well without understanding the entire trajectory, or choose an action while leaving its wider meaning open. Such speech does not certify special maturity or place you above people who have found suitable words. It answers for the limits of your knowledge. What matters is not uncertainty’s prestige but its precise place: which part remains unclear and what is already definite enough for action.

The time for silence and time for speech in Ecclesiastes 3:7 can be placed beside this task while retaining the text’s biblical foundation. It is no permission to await a perfect moment for every necessary message. Sometimes speaking is needed now because another person is already deciding on the basis of your words or silence. Sometimes a public account is unnecessary because the change remains personal inquiry. Appropriate timing here follows the article’s reasoning about actual consequences, not an instruction found in the verse for an individual reader. The brief image opens a question about proportion in speech without deciding what someone should disclose or which commitments to accept.

A new stage takes shape at different speeds in different areas. An activity may exist while a role is still discussed; an agreement may be clear while personal meaning changes. These need not be compressed into one ceremonial date. Each can be described with an appropriate

degree of certainty. A name then identifies life rather than ordering it to match immediately. Inquiry, action, consent, and correction remain available. Other people retain sufficient clarity where their participation is affected. This can be enough for today’s conversation: a change is real, its particular elements are named, and the whole stage has not yet been declared complete. Incompleteness remains a fact rather than an excuse or verdict.

What this means in practice

Choose one change to which you want to give a large name. Separately record three things: what you notice in your own relation to it, which step has been completed, and what participation has actually been agreed with others. If a line remains empty, do not fill it with a label. Mark what is unknown. Then write a working description conveying those facts. Interest, action, and a boundary can be expressed in one or several sentences. Accuracy matters more than brevity at any cost. You need not prove that the change belongs to a universal stage of life.

Consider a particular listener. What do they need to know to participate meaningfully, and what might they reasonably infer from your word? If it implies readiness or a promise, check whether that content is established. Add a missing limit: you are still considering, have agreed to this step, retain an earlier commitment, or are discussing conditions for continuation. A personal story can remain private while shared consequences are communicated sufficiently. If accurate communication requires conversation, the written note does not replace it.

After the next actual step, return to the description. What became known, what was done, and what changed in the agreement? Revise only what has new grounds, retaining the history of earlier participation. Do not make a new name the exercise’s compulsory outcome. It may appear later or be unnecessary for this conversation. This is an author-proposed practice of clear description, not a test of maturity, qualifications, or psychological efficacy. Its available result is that a change can be honestly communicated without treating an unfinished stage as an established form of life.

Key quotation

> *I am not yet able to rest in the assurance of THIS.*

Analects V.5: Ch’i-tiao K’ai’s answer to proposed official employment, translated by James Legge. The brief episode is not a modern qualification procedure.

Connections between traditions

1. **A name’s limits and a name’s accuracy.** Tao Teh King I.1 distinguishes a name that can be named from the enduring name in an account of the Tao; Analects XIII.3 connects rectifying names with speech’s relation to affairs. Their shared comparative field is a word’s relation to what it identifies. For a transition, this permits recognising a general self-description’s limits alongside the need for specific clarity. The foundations differ: a Daoist account of origin and naming is not a Confucian order of government. A working description today is the article’s application, not a common conclusion of both teachings. Neither passage certifies any new activity’s label.

2. **The time of speaking and readiness not yet accepted.** Ecclesiastes 3:7 places silence beside speech; in Analects V.5, Ch’i-tiao K’ai answers a proposal of office by stating a limit of assurance. The common comparative mechanism is relating speech to actual circumstances rather than immediately announcing complete readiness. This supports distinguishing acknowledged interest from consent to a role. Biblical language about timing and the Confucian learning episode nevertheless belong to different frames. They neither establish a universal delay nor replace a role’s specific requirements. They do not excuse silence about consequences for others.

3. **Naming and limits on knowledge of the whole.** In Tao Teh King I.1, naming does not exhaust the Tao; Ecclesiastes 3:11 identifies a limit on knowing God’s work from beginning to end. The shared field is the inability to turn an available description into possession of an entire meaning. A person today can name a current change while leaving its future form and earlier history open. The difference is fundamental: the Tao and God’s work are not presented as a single foundation. This comparison neither predicts a biography nor proves that every unclear event has a concealed destiny. What is unknown remains unknown.

4. **Speech and consequences of participation.** In Analects XIII.3, appropriate names relate to the possibility of carrying out what is spoken; Ecclesiastes 3:7 distinguishes a time for silence and for speech. Their shared mechanism is placing speech within action rather than merely decorating a self-image. The article develops this into sufficient clarity where others already plan on the basis of your words. The boundary remains: the Confucian passage concerns government, ritual, and punishments; the biblical passage concerns times under heaven. Neither supplies a modern procedure for disclosing private information. Sufficient clarity does not give someone else a right to know everything.

5. **Unestablished assurance and a provisional description.** The pupil’s answer in Analects V.5 does not represent readiness as established; Tao Teh King I.1 distinguishes available naming from an enduring name. Their common comparative field is restraint about what present speech does not yet establish. This supports taking a manageable step without first producing

a complete new biography. Lack of assurance about an office is nevertheless not identical to a Daoist limit of naming. The comparison neither requires permanent namelessness nor confirms competence through a feeling of readiness alone. An action, its conditions, and consent remain separate subjects for examination.

Primary sources

1. **Tao Teh King, I.1.** James Legge English translation. Complete chapter 1, its four portions, and header read; neighbouring chapter 2 is context only. A bounded account of naming is used. The underlying print date was not established here; no whole-work or Chinese-text reading is asserted.

2. **Analects V.5 and XIII.3.** James Legge English translation. The full V.5 episode and all seven XIII.3 portions read. Key quotation: Ch'i-tiao K'ai's speech in V.5. This digitization contains the English portion; the Chinese text and Legge notes are separate and were not used here.

3. **Ecclesiastes 3:1–15.** Checked passage, KJV. All 15 displayed verses read. The epigraph is an exact lowercase fragment of 3:7; 3:11 is also adopted for a bounded knowledge comparison. The English quotation from the Analects is attributed to Legge, while the biblical fragment is displayed KJV. RU renderings are United Wisdom's own; no separate published Russian version is claimed.

Tags

life transition, new stage, naming, working description, incompleteness, clear speech, interest, action, status, role, consent, promise, personal boundaries, shared consequences, readiness, inquiry, exploratory participation, continuity, earlier experience, participation history, revision, responsibility, agreement, self-description, sufficient knowledge, Tao Teh King, Analects, Ecclesiastes, Confucius, James Legge

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.