

UNITED WISDOM

The Rhythm of an Ordinary Day During Uncertainty

Meaning and Direction

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

P-10-N02 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

The Rhythm of an Ordinary Day During Uncertainty

Epigraph

> *enjoy the good of all his labour*

Ecclesiastes 3:13, exact interior fragment from displayed King James Version, without added punctuation. Its biblical gift framework is retained; no obligation to feel joy under every condition follows.

What this article is about

When an important question remains unsettled, an ordinary day can seem merely a pause before real life. Shopping, work, conversation, and preparing food appear to lose their meaning until the answer is known. Yet uncertainty about one event does not invalidate everything else. This article considers the rhythm of available actions: what can continue, what needs changing, and which conditions should be agreed with others. It provides no universal timetable, method for securing a desired outcome, or promise of psychological or bodily benefit. Epictetus, Aristotle, and Ecclesiastes offer different grounds for discussing a particular action, its quality, and ordinary participation in life. Their differences remain. The article's task is to leave a day sufficiently definite for manageable involvement without requiring complete calm or resolution first. How can a chosen activity continue while attention returns to the unknown, and how does useful recurrence differ from demands that present circumstances no longer support?

I. An unsettled question does not occupy every part of life

Consider an invented situation: someone is awaiting a reply about a new job. Checking their inbox begins to accompany almost every activity. Even a short conversation feels like a distraction from the main issue, although no new reply has arrived. The question genuinely matters in this example: income, plans, and the involvement of close people are affected. But the message does not arrive sooner because everything else is declared insignificant. The importance of waiting can be acknowledged separately from today's actions that remain real. Agreed work needs to be finished, availability communicated, accessible food prepared, or a friend's message answered. Their content is not determined solely by one message's outcome. This distinction requires neither finding the situation easy nor giving up the wish for an answer.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Everyday life contains different degrees of clarity at once. You may not know where you will work next month while knowing which meeting you accepted for tomorrow. The wider route is unclear, but the recipient of a necessary message is known. This does not mean every task can proceed exactly as before. Some depend on the future reply and genuinely need pausing. Others need a smaller extent, while still others retain their conditions. Distinguishing these cases is more useful than demanding either an entirely usual routine or the complete suspension of life until resolution. A day contains particular involvements rather than a single examination of your ability to handle uncertainty. Each involvement can be considered according to its actual conditions.

Rhythm here means an intelligible sequence of returns to chosen actions. It has no compulsory form: one person may have a fairly stable order, another only several available points within a changing day. What matters is its relation to what is actually needed and possible, rather than resemblance to an attractive timetable. Recurrence can identify participation: work is discussed at this point, a message answered after this task, or room retained for a conversation today. Such reference points do not determine the outcome being awaited. They clarify the present day. If circumstances change, a point can be revised while communicating affected consequences. A real rhythm leaves correction possible rather than providing another reason for self-accusation whenever its sequence is interrupted.

II. Begin with actual conditions

An ordinary day does not exist independently of housing, time, resources, or other people's involvement. Advice to preserve a familiar rhythm becomes empty when its earlier form is unavailable. Someone may previously have cooked at home and now live somewhere without a kitchen, or have worked uninterruptedly and now share time with caring for someone close. These differences cannot be removed by a correct attitude towards waiting. Begin by recognising conditions: where help is needed, which action is independently possible, and which requires agreement. This is the article's reasoning about manageable participation, not an assessment of anyone's discipline. An available form may be unattractive, yet acknowledging it allows concrete support to be discussed instead of demanding that intention alone restore an earlier day.

Choose an activity whose content is understood and ask what permits it now. The answer may be modest: enough information for a short letter, the possibility of examining one part of the work, or agreement to talk without final conclusions. That extent need not be called ideal. It can be sufficient for the particular action. If a required condition is missing, the task changes: request information, clarify expectations, or acknowledge that the action cannot happen today. Do not turn every shortage into a personal defect. A rhythm should account for missing

conditions as honestly as available ones. Sometimes returning usefully means updating an agreement rather than repeating the activity at its earlier scale.

In Enchiridion 4, Epictetus considers an action alongside circumstances that may hinder it. His bathing example belongs to a Stoic account of conformity to nature. A bounded analogy matters here: an intention has a particular object and meets conditions that cannot all be chosen. This is no demand to endure harm, abandon protection, or treat every consequence as unimportant. An action today may require changing conditions, declining participation, or seeking help. The resemblance concerns clarity about what you meant to do and how you wish to participate. A day's rhythm can be built with that clarity while retaining the right to recognise an obstacle as real and the chosen form as needing revision.

III. Recurrence has content as well as frequency

Repeating an action does not automatically make it meaningful. Messages may be answered daily in a way that leaves promises unclear, or work begun unfailingly while the agreed part is repeatedly avoided. Rhythm therefore includes the quality of participation: what is done, why, and under which conditions. In Nicomachean Ethics II.1, Aristotle connects formation with activity; II.4 prevents virtue from being reduced to outward repetition. This is an ancient ethical argument, not a modern investigation of habits. For our question it opens a distinction: regularity alone certifies neither an activity's usefulness nor the accuracy of its content or completeness of consent. A repeated action still needs to be understood on its own terms.

In an invented example, someone tells a project partner every evening that everything will soon become clear. The conversation reliably recurs, but its content gives no basis for planning: neither a date nor available work is identified. The recurrence can be retained while its content changes. Instead of general reassurance, say which part is ready, what remains unknown, and when clarification is possible. If that time is itself unknown, acknowledge it. The action becomes clearer without promising early resolution of the whole situation. The conversation need not be long or become continual reporting. It needs to relate its recurring form to the other person's actual task. Familiar return then supports involvement rather than merely the feeling of having completed a ritual.

An action's content can change while its outward appearance remains similar. The same walk might be a conversation, a necessary journey, or a chosen chance to notice surroundings. This article assigns it no therapeutic function and does not require that it be accessible to everyone. The point is to understand your task without attributing a demonstrated effect to it. Reading, a household activity, or a short shared undertaking can likewise be chosen for their actual meaning rather than their ability to certify a good condition. If a familiar form has lost its content, ask what no longer occurs within it and what alternative might be discussed.

Recurrence remains a means of participation rather than an independent measure of someone's worth.

IV. Ordinary participation need not await complete calm

Sometimes an activity seems possible only after concern stops returning. Waiting then acquires another condition: the unknown reply must first give way to the correct inner state. Yet a particular involvement does not always require inward agreement with the whole situation. A necessary message can be written while another question remains troubling, or a small part of work discussed without being able to tell the entire story. This does not claim that anyone can always act despite any condition. What is manageable must be considered in actual circumstances. Two things are distinguished here: desired calm and sufficient conditions for a particular action. The first may remain absent while the second exists, without devaluing the difficulty of waiting.

An everyday action need not conceal concern from others. If it affects shared involvement, a limit can be stated: one task can be discussed today, while the remaining questions await another conversation. This should not make the listener responsible for reassuring you before any work can happen. It gives them information for their own consent. They may suggest a smaller extent or say that the present format does not suit them. Rhythm becomes shared only where participation is actually agreed. You need not prove capacity for all your earlier work in order to retain one available meeting. Its limited extent nevertheless needs naming honestly rather than being represented as readiness for everything.

Ecclesiastes 3:11–13 places limited knowledge alongside ordinary participation while retaining its biblical understanding of God's gift. Comparison with Stoic action does not make their foundations identical. For this article, uncertainty about the whole need not make present activities empty. Prepared food, completed work, or conversation may have their own content while the later outcome is unclear. No obligation to feel joy follows, nor a claim that every kind of labour is accessible or fair. Everyday involvement may need its conditions protected, help sought, or an unsuitable form declined. A particular activity's meaning can be recognised without gratitude for every obstacle or a promise that the difficult period will end in the desired way.

V. A reference point permits change

A fairly stable order can be useful while it fits life. New information arriving midday may need considering before a planned activity. If a participant cannot attend, the earlier meeting time no longer creates shared action. If a necessary condition is absent, scheduled repetition does not supply it. A reference point is therefore better understood as an accepted description of involvement under known conditions. Changed conditions raise a question of revision. This differs from abandoning every sequence: available parts can remain while affected parts change. A day need not stay identical for its actions to be connected. Connection can also appear in honest revision when its reason and affected participants are clear.

In Nicomachean Ethics II.2, Aristotle considers particular action in relation to its occasion rather than as an exact application of a general precept. This provides a bounded ground for asking whether a form is proportionate. His historical comparisons with health and exercise are not used here as medical recommendations. We calculate no correct quantities of food, exertion, or rest. The point is that a meeting, work, or household activity requires attention to current conditions. Less time may require a smaller result; a changed task may need its content clarified. A general reference point begins consideration without exempting us from it. Revising a plan can be more appropriate than defending its constancy as a virtue in itself.

Revision becomes clearer when it concerns a particular part rather than a total assessment of the day. Not every sequence is destroyed: one meeting moved, one reply remains unknown, or one activity cannot happen today. Other parts can continue if their conditions remain. This language does not prohibit acknowledging a difficult day. It helps identify consequences without unnecessary expansion: who needs notice, what can be finished now, and what help might be discussed. If the uncompleted action was promised, changing a personal plan does not cancel that promise. Sufficient communication with the other side is needed. A revisable rhythm includes responsibility for changes as well as freedom to alter one's own timetable.

VI. The unknown can be considered separately from each activity

An important unresolved question has actions of its own: check an existing message, collect needed information, request clarification, or discuss consequences. These differ from repeatedly revisiting the same thing without new data. This article sets no required checking frequency and promises no end to concern through a chosen order. Information may need frequent attention because timely participation depends on it; sometimes that necessity is absent. The relevant ground is an actual condition, not a wish to demonstrate a correct attitude towards waiting. Ask what today's check should provide and which action it could enable. If there is no new result, that too is a precise answer rather than a demand to repeat the whole story immediately.

Return to the invented job application. The person can ask whether a response date exists and whether additional material is required. If no clarification is available, today's fact remains the absence of a reply. That guarantees no favourable outcome and proves no rejection. Other activities can be chosen without making each a means of influencing the message. Preparing current work means preparing current work; meeting a friend means participating in conversation. These can coexist with returning thoughts about waiting. They need not count as successful only once that thought no longer occurs. A particular result is considered according to the content of participation rather than the disappearance of uncertainty in another area.

Separation need not succeed immediately or become complete. The unknown may enter a conversation or change the ability to work. Acknowledge that it affects this particular activity today and revise the form: agree on a shorter meeting or leave part of the work open pending clarification. The task is not to make attention never return. It is more modest: do not treat a returning thought as automatic proof that ordinary involvement is meaningless. If sufficient conditions for the chosen activity are absent, it can be postponed or help discussed. Declining an unsuitable form can itself be a precise action within the day when what is not accepted, and why, is clear.

VII. A shared day needs agreement rather than mind-reading

One person's uncertainty may change another's day: a shared meal, household work, a meeting, or finishing a joint task. Concern does not automatically communicate these changes. Someone close may understand the question's importance while not knowing what involvement is available today. Distinguish an account of how things feel from an agreement about an activity. Listening can be requested and particular help discussed separately. An unknown reply can be acknowledged alongside the available part of the shared day. This demands no complete personal report. Relevant information allows the other person to choose participation, consider their conditions, and avoid interpreting silence as an earlier promise.

In an invented scene, someone awaiting a decision about moving wants to discuss it every evening. The other person is willing to talk but cannot continually cancel their activities. Support does not require their whole day to belong to the first person's waiting. An available conversation and a way to communicate genuinely new information can be discussed. This does not turn the relationship into a scheduled procedure: spontaneity, attention, and clarification remain. But its shared form becomes clearer. If important news requires different involvement, that is discussed separately. A personal rhythm establishes no duties for another without their consent. The continuity of shared life depends on actual agreements rather than equal intensity of concern about one event.

Agreed help also has particular content. Someone may take one household task, attend a meeting, or help clarify a message. This does not establish availability for everything indefinitely. Gratitude should not conceal the question of limits, and declining one form need not mean absence of care. A day's rhythm includes that clarity because ordinary actions often connect people. Your involvement may become possible through accepted help. That help can be recognised as an actual condition rather than evidence that independence has disappeared. Discussing limits preserves honest cooperation: each person understands what is accepted now and what still requires separate consent, without one useful action silently becoming unlimited responsibility.

VIII. An interrupted activity can resume from its present point

An interrupted sequence can create the temptation to start again with an ideal day. Unfinished work seems spoiled, while a missed meeting appears to prove the absence of rhythm. Yet many activities permit resuming from their present point. Identify what was done, what remains, and which conditions changed. The beginning need not always be repeated. A part that retains its meaning remains completed, while an unnecessary part may be removed. This concerns particular activities rather than every situation alike. A new beginning or further agreement may genuinely be required. Examine that specific requirement instead of deriving a total verdict from one interruption. Participation's history can contain a pause without becoming fictitious.

Where others are involved, resuming cannot be determined solely by your wish. Their need or availability may have changed during the pause. In an invented project, previously agreed material is no longer needed in its earlier form. Its author can clarify what should remain rather than silently deliver an old result as current. This need not mean losing the entire work; content may remain useful differently. Sufficient clarity distinguishes what was completed from what is still needed. Returning includes checking relevance rather than only resolving to sit down again. Continuation then serves actual participation instead of proving that an earlier plan was never interrupted and requires no further questions.

Returning to an activity does not certify inward sameness. Participation can continue with a different assessment, extent, or question. There is no need to pretend waiting has had no effect on life. Continuity appears not only in repeating one form but in honestly reconnecting intention, conditions, and action. Aristotle's question about activity's quality can again be placed beside Stoic attention to the particular action, while their ethical foundations remain distinct. The article applies the comparison to revising today's activity. Neither ancient text sets a universal speed of return or licenses assessing a person by missed sessions. What is manageable and what is genuinely agreed remain separate conditions.

IX. A day need not prove that waiting was handled correctly

An ordinary rhythm can become another personal report: how much was completed, how smoothly a meeting went, or whether a message went unchecked. A record may help particular planning, but it measures no person's worth and certifies no correct experience of uncertainty. This article establishes no productivity norm. If less work is possible, its consequences and conditions need understanding rather than a diagnosis or moral rank. A day may contain few available actions. Their small number does not prove that all life stopped, just as a large number proves no resolution of every important question. The content and limits of each involvement matter more than an impressive total.

Every household activity need not acquire a special spiritual meaning before it can matter. Clean dishes permit later use, an intelligible letter enables conversation, and completed work serves a shared task. Such grounds can be sufficient. Ecclesiastes speaks within its biblical frame, while a reader today can consider an action's particular content without adopting the whole frame. Comparison requires no single belief. It leaves a question open: which activities matter in themselves rather than solely as preparation for an unknown outcome? The answer need not be elevated. One ordinary involvement may be available and understood by you and someone else; that can be enough to recognise it as real.

The awaited event remains separate from the quality of today's participation. A well-completed task does not purchase a desired reply; a difficult day does not cause rejection or certify an unfavourable future. This distinction prevents rhythm from becoming a bargain with the outcome: live correctly enough, and the important question must resolve as wanted. The article's sources demonstrate no such connection. Actions, conditions, and communication with particular content remain available. They may affect the unresolved situation where an actual relation exists, or belong elsewhere. That relation needs consideration separately rather than attributing power over the unknown to an entire day. Rhythm then supports involvement without promising control over the future.

X. A sufficient rhythm remains living participation

An ordinary rhythm may be small: a clear beginning to available work, a necessary message, shared involvement, and room to revise after new information. It need not be identical across people or periods. Ask what each part exists for. A form that enables real activity can be retained; one that only certifies conformity to someone else's example may need its grounds reconsidered. This does not prescribe abandoning timetables: a stable order can be convenient. The point is the ability to relate a form to your circumstances and other participants. A chosen order should serve intelligible action rather than make someone a perpetual executor of rules whose origin and meaning are no longer clear.

Uncertainty leaves room not only for work but for relationships, freely chosen activities, and acknowledging need. These parts need not all be justified by their usefulness to the future decision. Conversation may matter because a relationship exists, reading because a question interests you, and a request because conditions require someone else's involvement. Their meanings are considered separately. Order does not remove choice or require filling the day completely. Unoccupied time is not necessarily an error needing immediate correction through work. Space can remain for involvement not yet determined without representing it as a promise. Such a rhythm is sufficiently clear for action and sufficiently open for genuine change.

When the important decision eventually appears, today's actions do not disappear from history. Some may enter a later stage; others remain particular events within a difficult period. Their wider meaning need not be assigned in advance. Recognise what is completed, what is agreed, and what remains unknown. An ordinary day is not a draft that acquires meaning only after the reply. It already contains your participation and others'. This thought does not make waiting pleasant or remove its conditions. It prevents one unresolved question from being given authority to invalidate the whole present life. A beginning may be a simple clarification: this activity is available today, its meaning is understood, and the later outcome remains open.

What this means in practice

Choose one present day without trying to organise the entire waiting period. Separate the unresolved question from two or three actions that retain meaning independently of its answer. For each, identify its content, available conditions, and affected participants. If it is currently impossible, name the missing condition rather than demanding greater composure. A smaller form or help may be discussed. No prescribed activities, waking times, diet, or exertion are required: this concerns clarity of involvement rather than a health regime.

Identify one point of return: after which event or under which agreed condition will the activity begin? Check that this creates no promise on another person's behalf. Where involvement is shared, clarify availability, extent, and how a change will be communicated. Separately consider whether any actual action concerning the unknown is available today: clarification, a message, or obtaining information. Do not require that check when its conditions are absent or treat a lack of news as proof of the future outcome.

After available participation, note what happened and which conditions changed. If the order was interrupted, consider the particular part: can it resume, or is revision or notice needed? Assess neither yourself by the day's perfection nor success by the disappearance of every thought about waiting. This is an author-proposed practice of description, not a clinical procedure or maturity test. Its available result is clearer content and limits of today's actions. The important decision can remain unknown while part of ordinary life already takes a real form.

Key quotation

> *we become just by doing just acts*

Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics II.1, exact interior lowercase fragment, translated by W. D. Ross. II.4 does not reduce the quality of choice to outward recurrence.

Connections between traditions

1. **Circumstances of action and a particular occasion.** Enchiridion 4 considers bathing amid possible hindrances; Nicomachean Ethics II.2 relates conduct to a particular occasion. Their shared comparative field is action under conditions that a general intention cannot replace. The article applies this by naming an available activity and examining today's form of participation rather than requiring the earlier order. Stoic conformity to nature nevertheless differs from Aristotelian ethical consideration. Neither passage establishes a modern regime or demands enduring harm. Changed conditions, seeking help, or declining participation can remain real responses to an obstacle. The comparison opens consideration of an activity without supplying a universal answer on the reader's behalf.

2. **The quality of recurrence and ordinary labour's meaning.** Aristotle II.1 addresses formation through activity; Ecclesiastes 3:12–13 places ordinary participation within a biblical gift framework. The article's common mechanism is considering today's action for its content rather than merely as a pause before the future. This allows asking what completed work or an intelligible message contributes in its own area. Aristotelian moral formation is nevertheless not God's gift, and participating in labour does not certify virtue. The comparison promises neither enjoyment nor income and makes no recurring activity automatically just. Actual conditions and consequences remain subjects for separate consideration rather than being resolved by the fact that an activity happens regularly.

3. **An action's object and incomplete knowledge of the whole.** In Enchiridion 4, a particular activity does not exhaust the encounter with circumstances; Ecclesiastes 3:11 retains a limit on knowledge of God's work. Their shared field is present participation without possession of the entire outcome. This supports distinguishing an available daily activity from an important unresolved question. Stoic intention and the biblical knowledge limit nevertheless form no single metaphysics. Comparison proves no concealed favourable plan and declares no consequence unimportant. It leaves the unknown open, considering action through its actual relation to circumstances while retaining the possibility of revision and protection. An intelligible present action need not claim authority over an unknowable future.

4. **A chosen manner and outward recurrence.** Nicomachean Ethics II.4 distinguishes outward activity from conditions of choice; Enchiridion 4 identifies a manner of participation alongside bathing. Their shared comparative mechanism is that an observable sequence alone cannot explain an action's meaning. The article develops this into examining a recurring conversation: it may clarify involvement or merely repeat an unsupported promise. Aristotelian conditions of virtue and Stoic conformity to nature remain distinct, and no universal personality assessment is established here. Keeping a timetable supplies no moral rank. Consideration concerns a

particular statement, its grounds, and agreed participation rather than someone's entire worth or their conformity to an attractive image of a well-ordered day.

5. **A proportionate form and ordinary involvement without guarantees.** In Aristotle II.2, a particular occasion is not replaced by an exact general precept; Ecclesiastes 3:13 speaks of ordinary labour within its biblical frame. The article's common mechanism is retaining an action's content without making one form compulsory for everyone. During uncertainty, a smaller available extent, a different sequence, or help can be discussed instead of competing with an ideal image. The ancient ethical question is nevertheless not biblical teaching about a gift, and neither text establishes therapeutic effects for this practice. Conditions of labour, bodily needs, and promises to others remain real; the comparison requires examining them separately rather than treating routine as their solution.

Primary sources

1. **Epictetus, Enchiridion 4.** Checked Elizabeth Carter translation. Both paragraphs and labelled translator header fully read. Stoic foundation retained; nearby sections not adopted as additional support. No whole-work or underlying print-edition check claimed.

2. **Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics II.1–2 and II.4.** Checked W. D. Ross translation. All three chosen sections and header fully read. The key quotation is a short II.1 fragment. Historical bodily examples are not medical instructions; no Greek collation claimed.

3. **Ecclesiastes 3:11–13.** Checked verses, KJV. All three verses and version labels fully read. The epigraph is an interior 3:13 fragment. The Aristotelian English quotation is Ross translation, the biblical English fragment is displayed KJV, and RU renderings are United Wisdom’s own translations through these editions; no published Russian version claimed.

Tags

uncertainty, waiting, ordinary day, rhythm, recurrence, action, participation, quality of conduct, conditions, manageable involvement, help, consent, agreement, household activities, work, communication, attention, limits of knowledge, revision, continuation, interruption, clarity, responsibility, personal boundaries, shared day, Epictetus, Aristotle, Ecclesiastes, ethics, independence

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.