

UNITED WISDOM

A closing ritual and the actual change in responsibilities

Meaning and Direction

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

P-12-N02 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

A closing ritual and the actual change in responsibilities

Epigraph

> *In festive ceremonies, it is better to be sparing than extravagant.*

— Confucius, Analects III.4; James Legge's English translation.

What this article is about

After a final gathering, participants clear the table, take a photograph and say that an important chapter has ended. Days later, one receives a question about documents; another is asked to manage the group's messages for a further month. The farewell was sincere, yet nobody clarified which tasks were actually complete. This essay examines the distance between a sign of completion and a change in specific responsibilities. A ritual can preserve a memory, make a transition visible and provide a shared language. That does not establish that every expectation has disappeared or everyone has accepted a new role. A limited comparison of Confucius, Cicero and Durkheim helps us respect symbolic form while separately considering consent, timing and handover. This is a philosophical discussion of an ordinary transition, rather than legal guidance about contracts or a compulsory ceremony. An ending may be warm, awkward, quiet, or unmarked by any gathering at all.

I. The gathering ends, but the messages continue

Imagine a small group that spent several months preparing a neighbourhood exhibition. Marina kept the participants' list; Pavel arranged the venue; others helped when they could. At the final gathering, everyone offers thanks and puts photographs into a box. Marina understands this as the end of her coordinating role. Pavel expects the list to be updated for another week, since two participants have not collected their materials. Neither is trying to deceive the other. They have given the same event different practical meanings, discovering the difference only when another message arrives after the celebration. This scene is invented for the essay. It identifies no established psychological type and makes no claim about how often such misunderstandings occur.

The closing words need not be empty. The gathering really happened, the exhibition closed, and the shared effort received recognition. The difficulty begins when one meaning of the occasion quietly takes over another task. Thanks acknowledge a contribution; handing over the list establishes who now holds the relevant information; agreeing to an extra week

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

concerns future participation. These things can happen together, but none automatically proves the others. If nobody asked Marina about additional tasks after the photograph, her evident pleasure does not establish agreement to them. Equally, her relief does not tell Pavel that the materials have already been passed on. Each question concerns a different part of their situation.

In this scene, it is more useful to identify what differs than to assess the quality of the celebration. What remains: a file, voluntary assistance, an earlier promise, or one person's hope? Asking does not require Marina to continue, nor make Pavel guilty for having any expectation. It keeps a meaningful occasion from becoming an argument about inaccessible intentions. The group might arrange a brief handover, find someone else, or acknowledge that part of the work remains unfinished. None of those answers erases the thanks. Past participation can be recognised as real even when today's conversation needs more exact language and does not yet produce a convenient resolution for everyone.

II. Three different meanings of completion

Completion may have a personal meaning: someone feels that an important period of life has ended. It may have a public meaning: others recognise the change and stop addressing that person in the former role. It may also have a practical meaning: a particular task is finished, materials have been transferred, or an agreed period of involvement has ended. This distinction is proposed here as a way of reasoning, rather than a complete classification of rituals. The meanings can overlap within an actual occasion. Distinguishing them helps when one person is already saying farewell to a role while another still relies on an unclear agreement. An inward feeling and an outward question need not occur simultaneously for both to merit attention.

Suppose a teacher leaves a voluntary study group. The final meeting may change how people address them without settling ownership of a book left in the cupboard. Returning for the book does not necessarily mean resuming the duty to teach. Conversely, announcing the semester's end does not report where shared notes have gone. The situation becomes clearer when each action is connected with its own object. Teaching has ended; the book remains a personal possession; the notes need an agreed handover. This prevents past involvement from turning into an indefinite duty, while a specific unfinished matter is not dissolved into a broad declaration about entering a new chapter of life.

Attending to the object of a question does not make a ceremony less significant. It releases the occasion from the impossible task of saying everything at once. A song, meal or shared gesture may express what an administrative message cannot easily hold: gratitude, sadness, and memories of working together. Expressive power does not imply complete information. Someone can value the gathering and later ask about access to a file; someone can transfer

the file while declining the celebration. People need not demonstrate the seriousness of a transition through identical behaviour. Different aspects of completion require different evidence. Asking one photograph to establish them all leaves important questions unanswered.

III. A form that carries attention

In the selected Analects passages, Confucius connects ritual with humane virtue and reverence, rather than outward performance alone. In III.4, his answer to Lin Fang prefers restraint to extravagance in festive ceremonies; mourning is discussed separately in relation to deep sorrow. These are different occasions within a particular ritual order, not a universal instruction to make every celebration inexpensive. Our limited comparison concerns the fact that an accomplished form does not by itself identify the attitude it carries. An ancient hierarchy cannot simply be transplanted into a contemporary group. Yet we can ask whether a ceremony attends to the person whose participation is ending, or only to the image of a successful event.

Suppose a group plans to thank someone through a surprise public speech. The organisers see this as respect; the recipient would prefer a short conversation without discussing personal circumstances. The size of the gift does not settle the central question. Gratitude can be expressed in a way that leaves the recipient room to respond. In our contemporary scene, this is an editorial conclusion about consent, not an unspoken quotation from Confucius. People can ask about an acceptable form, offer a choice, or allow the person to avoid speaking. Declining a speech does not establish ingratitude toward the group. Attention also means allowing a recipient not to display the expected happiness for the sake of a harmonious picture.

Nor can an observer establish an empty form through one impression. A quiet person may value the gathering deeply; a talkative person may simply not know how to say goodbye. This essay does not diagnose sincerity from someone's manner. A more accessible question concerns how the occasion is arranged: does it permit different ways of participating, and leave practical matters sufficiently clear? If so, a modest farewell can carry weight without the expected tears or an impressive speech. If not, greater ceremony will not remove uncertainty. Respect for form becomes more attentive when we stop testing another person's inward state against an outward template and return to matters we can actually ask about.

IV. Why a shared sign can matter

In the part of The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life read for this essay, Durkheim considers shared actions and ideals within a sociological theory of religion. This is a historical explanatory position, not an established cause of every contemporary experience. It provides a way to ask about shared recognition: people may gather to acknowledge what they experienced together, as well as to exchange information. The theory retains its own subject, generalisations and limits. A neighbourhood exhibition does not become a religious cult because we describe it that way. The comparison concerns a shared sign's role without equating the content, authority or origins of different ceremonies, or treating them as interchangeable practices.

A participant may want to hear that the shared work was genuinely noticed. Their name will disappear from future schedules, while the meetings they organised remain part of the group's history. A celebration can give that distinction a visible form. Without a shared sign, others may habitually message the former coordinator; the occasion may help them remember a change. This describes a possibility within an invented scene, not a measured effect promised by ritual. One gathering may be insufficient, especially if the schedule and contact list remain unchanged. Shared memory and ordinary information updates can support one another while performing different tasks and without guaranteeing that everyone will understand the change identically.

A wish for a shared sign should not become a demand for identical interpretation. One participant found the exhibition a major turning point; another experienced it as worthwhile work over several weekends. They need not agree on one life story to recognise a particular contribution. The work and the new arrangement can be named without claiming that everyone underwent an inward renewal. Even the phrase about a chapter ending may hold different personal meanings. Such differences need not destroy the occasion. They let shared memory remain both sufficiently precise and sufficiently spacious, so that gratitude does not turn into a test of belonging, depth of feeling, or the right explanation of one's own life.

V. A promise after circumstances change

In De Officiis I.10, Cicero considers altered circumstances through grounds of justice that include avoiding harm and serving common interests. His examples make fidelity to a promise a matter of judgement about a situation, rather than mechanically repeating earlier words. This is ancient ethical reasoning; its historical references to law do not establish the validity of a contemporary contract. For our discussion, a change needs substantive consideration. A person's declaration about entering a new chapter does not establish that a promise is fulfilled, cancelled, or harmful. We need to know what was actually promised, to whom, under what conditions, and what has now changed in relation to that particular undertaking.

Marina may have promised to maintain the list until the exhibition closed, or separately agreed to transfer it to the next coordinator. Those formulations concern different things. If the conversation survives only in memory, choosing the person with the more confident voice does not necessarily resolve the difference. They can compare what each recalls, acknowledge the unclear part, and discuss what is presently possible. The essay prescribes no required outcome. A particular issue may need another procedure or appropriate professional assistance. The philosophical distinction helps earlier: a broad wish for someone's future success should not become evidence that they agreed to another month of work after leaving the role.

The opposite mistake treats an earlier promise as permanent because the shared experience was intense. Someone once supported the group, received thanks, and is now supposedly required to remain available indefinitely. Recognition of a past contribution does not create an endless new agreement. If conditions have changed, the person can name the relevant details: current time, capacity to participate, and any remaining handover. Doing so need not condemn their earlier self as naive or dismiss the relationship as false. Two facts can stand together: past agreement may have been genuine, while present participation needs a different decision. A closing ceremony can mark that boundary without being asked to decide the matter in place of those involved.

VI. When the act itself changes a relationship

It would be too simple to say that a symbol merely decorates a change that happened elsewhere. In an imagined group, handing over a key can be both a sign of trust and an agreed action: one person stops holding it, another accepts it and understands its purpose. An announcement may also communicate a decision already made. The question is therefore not how symbolic an object appears. What matters is what is being done, by whom, on what grounds, and with whose actual participation. Different meanings sometimes meet in one gesture. They remain distinguishable even when they occur together and the participants see no need to accompany every action with a lengthy explanation.

Suppose the participants clearly agreed before the gathering to hand the venue over to a new coordinator. During the evening, the former coordinator gives them the key, they accept it, and the shared contact list is updated. Within this scene, the ceremony participates in a real change of relations. Its expressive quality is no reason to dismiss it as empty. But if a key was placed on the table for a photograph while responsibilities remained undiscussed, the image does not establish the same thing. We distinguish acts by their known content, rather than dividing the world into serious practical work and useless symbols. This preserves a gesture's significance when it genuinely carries an action understood by those involved.

A religious or otherwise established ceremony may have a meaning within its own tradition that cannot be settled by analogy with a neighbourhood exhibition. This essay determines neither the validity of an initiation, membership in a community, nor a person's legal status. In an unfamiliar situation, one may ask how participants understand the rite and who can explain its rules, without automatically adopting every rule as one's own. An ordinary personal transition permits a more modest question: which change are we marking, and which have we actually agreed? That leaves room for meaningful action within form, while refusing to treat attendance, outward participation or respectful silence as unconditional agreement to every possible meaning of an occasion.

VII. Handover and the freedom to finish participating

A transition may have a small but significant material side. Shared notes remain with someone who no longer leads the meetings; only two people know the new contact's address; the old name is still on the schedule. These details do not explain the participant's whole life, yet they can bring questions back after the farewell. Addressing them needs no new ritual and no verdict that the first gathering failed. In the imagined scene, it is enough to identify what exists, who can access it, and whether a handover needs agreement. This prescribes neither disclosure of personal information nor remaining in an unwanted relationship. Attention to the task makes sense alongside boundaries of access, participation and safety.

An unfinished item should not quietly turn into indefinite availability. Transferring a list and continually correcting it for the new coordinator are different forms of involvement. Someone can agree to the first and decline the second. Where a conversation is possible and useful, the limit of that specific assistance can be named. Not every request after an ending violates a boundary, just as earlier help does not create every later obligation. A request's significance depends on its content and the response, as well as the date. The group can propose a task while remaining able to hear a refusal. A former participant can help without resuming the whole of their old role.

A good history of working together can make precision feel difficult: nobody wants to spoil the relationship with a dry inventory. Yet specificity can be part of respect. Saying that only a file handover is possible today gives the other person something clear on which to base a decision. It does not guarantee a pleasant response; this essay promises no conflict-free ending. It does reduce the need to guess whether a smile and a wish for success mean willingness to work for another month. An ending can be sufficiently clear even when participants do not feel equally relieved. Finishing one's involvement does not require a perfect atmosphere, and gratitude for the past need not mean agreeing to every future proposal.

VIII. Recognition does not require reconciliation with everything

A ceremony may bring together different accounts of the same undertaking. Someone remembers mutual support, another remembers exhaustion, and another values the result but would not repeat the way people worked. A single speech about a wonderful journey may leave some without accurate words for their experience. Completion need not require one shared judgement of the past. People can recognise the work while disagreeing about its distribution. They can accept thanks without confirming that every episode was good. This matters especially when a shared sign is used to close every question for good. A celebratory formula does not report that disagreement has disappeared or that any harm has been addressed.

Suppose Pavel thanks Marina, while she wants to clarify why the final week became overloaded. In our example, gratitude and a question can coexist. Asking need not interrupt the whole evening or require telling everyone the complete story. Equally, joining a photograph does not mean surrendering the possibility of a later conversation. The essay requires no reconciliation, continued contact or public acknowledgement of pain. It proposes that we not assign more decisions to a gesture than it carried. If discussion is impossible or unsafe, personal completion may happen without a conversation with the group. Important concrete circumstances retain their significance and may need a different route to appropriate assistance.

Durkheim's account of the collective ideal draws attention to the shared story as an object of joint action. It does not establish that every story is just, or that a majority may determine each participant's memory. Here, a historical theory meets an original contemporary question about freedom of participation; the grounds are kept separate. Sometimes a more accurate conclusion is modest: the work happened, participation is appreciated, and some questions remain open. That may be less impressive than a promise of complete renewal. It does not ask people to certify that their differences have vanished before the past can count as finished. A shared occasion can hold a limited meaning when those involved allow that limitation.

IX. Different dates for the same ending

The exhibition closed on Friday, the list was transferred on Monday, and Marina's sense of a different life arrived later still. This need not mean the ending was wrong. An action, public recognition and personal experience can have different temporal boundaries. Practical work may be finished while someone continues remembering conversations. Someone else may have inwardly left a role before the agreed date and still complete an agreed handover. The essay establishes no correct sequence for everyone. It suggests that different dates do not by themselves prove continuing duty, immaturity or a failed rite. Assessing a particular task requires information about that task, rather than only someone's mood after the final evening.

If old messages keep arriving, it helps to distinguish other people's habits from the actual state of a task. One person missed the updated list; another knows about the transition but proposes new help; a third asks about materials genuinely not yet transferred. All three messages appear to come from the past, but their content differs. So may the replies: a new contact, declining a new task, or clarifying handover. There is no need for one universal response. Restoring a question's particular object makes it less necessary to treat every message as proof that an earlier chapter governs the whole of life. Tiredness with such requests can still be understandable without any diagnostic judgement.

A personal sense of completion cannot be required to arrive on a particular date. It may change, return to earlier memories, or never become a distinct event at all. That uncertainty does not make a sufficiently clear next day impossible. Someone can know where they no longer need to go in the morning, what has left their schedule, and which specific questions remain open. An everyday boundary can thus be real without a ceremonial feeling. There is no requirement to find an additional rite that finally fixes the inward change. Experience can remain complex while today's actions have intelligible limits. Neither emptiness nor relief after a gathering proves the quality of an entire period of life.

X. An ending that promises no complete reset

A worthwhile ending may be modest. It names what changed, acknowledges what happened, and leaves room for what is still unknown. It need not destroy the earlier connection, explain every disagreement, or immediately open a more important project. If Marina stops coordinating, she does not have to prove the transition by rejecting everyone she knew. If she remains in contact, that does not automatically restore old responsibilities. Memory, friendship, possessions and a role may continue differently. A complete reset is not the measure of success here. A more exact question concerns a specific new boundary that the person and others can understand sufficiently clearly, even if the entire future remains undecided.

The three interlocutors provide no single recipe. Confucian attention to ritual quality, Cicero's judgement about duty, and Durkheim's theory of the collective ideal rest on different grounds. Comparing them lets us consider form, the justice of a relationship, and shared recognition without presenting them as one law of human transitions. Our contemporary conclusion is more modest: a closing sign merits attention, but cannot replace unknown information about consent or a task's state. Where an act genuinely forms part of a handover understood by participants, its symbolic significance can accompany practical change. Where clarity is absent, expressive power does not automatically create it. This distinction requires neither contempt for ceremony nor compulsory participation in one.

The gathering ends, the group keeps the box of photographs, and the list passes to a new coordinator. For Marina, this may simply conclude one involvement, without a story about becoming a different person. For Pavel, it may be a reason to offer thanks and change his habitual way of contacting her. If a question remains, they can name it separately without reinstating the whole earlier chapter. This scene promises no ideal world and assumes no universal access to conversation. It shows a narrower possibility: the past is recognised, future participation is not appropriated, and a specific task has its own place. Completion need not do everything at once. Its words and actions can respect the person they address without reporting more agreement than actually occurred.

What this means in practice

If you would like to apply this distinction to an ordinary ending, choose one small situation that is safe to consider now. This is a voluntary editorial exercise with no established efficacy. It requires neither disclosing your personal history, performing a rite, nor contacting someone when contact is unwanted. Simply finishing the reading is an available choice.

Name separately the sign of completion, the known change, and one particular open question. For example: a farewell meal took place; participation in weekly meetings has ended; the shared file's location remains unclear. Do not add another person's presumed agreement to a

known fact. If the question concerns only your future actions, naming your own available limit may be enough. If it concerns a shared arrangement and conversation is possible, you can ask what still needs clarification and who actually agrees to participate.

You can then stop. The purpose is neither a flawless handover plan nor a test of whether you experienced the transition deeply enough. A necessary next act may be small and specific; where action is unavailable, that limit can also be acknowledged. The exercise replaces neither needed assistance nor the appropriate way to address a legal, work or personal matter. The outcome might be one more accurate sentence: an important chapter has ended in this respect, while this particular item remains open. It promises no calm, agreement from others or immediate new meaning. It does make room to stop asking a ceremony to answer a question that was never settled within it.

Key quotation

> *moral duty also undergoes a change, and it does not always remain the same.*

— Cicero, De Officiis I.10 §31; Walter Miller's English translation, exact continuous clause. This is ethical reasoning about circumstances, not a rule of current law.

Connections between traditions

Comparisons are limited to the passages actually read. Contemporary scenes and practical conclusions are editorial reasoning; the sources retain different grounds.

Comparison

Two textual grounds

Concepts and difference

Mechanism for this topic

What this does not establish

Form and the substance of a relationship

Confucius, Analects III.3: ritual considered with humane virtue; Cicero, De Officiis I.7 §23: fidelity to promises forms part of justice's ground.

Confucian ritual quality and Roman good faith are distinct. One concerns the human relationship within form; the other concerns truthfulness and fidelity in an undertaking.

In the invented scene, thanks can acknowledge the participant while transferring a list addresses a particular agreement. One accomplished gesture does not automatically report both outcomes.

Neither the universal emptiness of ceremony nor a right to diagnose sincerity from a face. Ancient grounds are not turned into contemporary psychological assessment.

Restraint and a symbol's significance beyond immediate use

Confucius III.4: festive restraint, with mourning separately discussed; Durkheim, Conclusion pp.423–424: collective representations and acts are not reduced to immediate utility.

A norm concerning form and a historical sociological explanation have different subjects. Restraint does not mean removing symbols; symbolic meaning is not practical reporting.

A gathering can be simple and meaningful while leaving a file's location unsettled. This permits an ending without choosing between extravagant ceremony and complete rejection of a farewell.

Neither an inexpensive-celebration rule for all cultures nor an established effect of a particular farewell. Durkheim's theory supplies no efficacy evidence for the proposed exercise.

Changed duty and a collective ideal

Cicero I.10 §§31–32: circumstances alter judgement about a promise through grounds of justice; Durkheim, Conclusion pp.422–423: shared action is connected with a collective ideal.

Judgement about a particular promise differs from an account of collective significance. A shared picture of completion can coexist with an unfinished item.

Participants recognise their joint work, then clarify whether a later transfer was promised and what is now possible. A shared story cannot replace information about who promised what to whom.

Neither automatic cancellation of a contract through a feeling nor a duty to embrace a collective ideal. Contemporary legal consequences are not determined here.

Outward performance and a publicly noticeable change

Confucius III.26: ceremonies without reverence are criticised; Durkheim, Conclusion I pp.418–420: joint action and symbolic form enter his sociological account of religion.

Normative attention to relationship quality differs from an explanatory account of collective action. Outward appearance and public recognisability raise different questions.

A farewell may help the group notice a coordinator's departure, while acceptable participation remains a separate question. Visibility does not establish each person's agreement.

Neither transplantation of an ancient hierarchy nor a majority's right to determine an inward experience. Cultural forms and religious grounds are not equated.

Good faith and jointly marking a boundary

Confucius I.13: agreements considered in relation to what is right; Cicero I.10 §33: deceptive literalism condemned.

An agreement's appropriateness and avoidance of an interpretive trick are compared as limited ethical orientations. They supply neither identical law nor a universal exit procedure.

In the invented case, an understood key handover can be both a symbol and a change of role. A photograph of a key without that understood act cannot claim the same meaning through resemblance alone.

Neither the validity of an initiation nor every gesture's legal force. An established ceremony needs its own context, beyond analogy with an exhibition.

Different personal meanings and an exact open question

Durkheim, Conclusion pp.423–424: individual ideals considered in relation to collective ones; Cicero I.9 §30 and I.10 §31: judgement attends to others' circumstances and grounds of duty.

Historical theory about individualising ideals and ethical attention to circumstances supply no single law of transition. The essay distinguishes personal meaning from a fact about a task.

One sees a turning point in life, another a project's end; they can still establish a file's location. A single biography is unnecessary for naming an open item and the limit of further involvement.

Neither appropriation of consent nor guaranteed reconciliation. A shared memory does not remove disagreement or establish that possible harm was addressed.

Primary sources

1. Confucius. Analects III.3–4 and III.26, with I.12–13 as additional context. The complete displayed book III and the stated part of book I were read in James Legge's English translation. Chinese text and notes were not collated. Checked edition.

2. Cicero. De Officiis I.10 §§31–33, with I.7 §§20–23 and I.9 §§28–30 as context. Walter Miller's English translation, 1913 edition. The stated English passages and title information were read; adjacent Latin does not imply philological collation. Checked edition.

3. Emile Durkheim. The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life, Conclusion: opening, section I and discussion of collective ideals through pp.423–424. Joseph Ward Swain's translation from French; first published 1915, displayed reprint 1964. Selected text and title information were read. The historical theory is an interlocutor, not evidence that a contemporary rite is effective. Checked edition.

Both Russian quotations are United Wisdom's own translations from the named English editions; the English literals were checked against those editions. Limited comparisons do not replace study of entire works. Reuse rights beyond the source's stated jurisdiction remain unestablished; the Durkheim reprint's copyright notice is retained in the source ledger. No raw source text is imported into the library or vectors.

Tags

completion, ritual, responsibilities, transition, promise, consent, gratitude, memory, form, Confucius, Cicero, Durkheim, Analects, justice, ceremony, role, handover, agreement, expectation, respect, boundaries, symbol, change, shared work, voluntary participation, life transitions, meaning, attention, responsibility, farewell

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.