


UNITED WISDOM

# Repentance and repairing the consequences still within reach

Meaning and Direction

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

P-17-N02 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

# Repentance and repairing the consequences still within reach

## Epigraph

> *I restore him fourfold.*

— Luke 19:8, fragment of Zacchaeus’s declaration, King James Version (KJV). Context: Luke 19:1–10; not a contemporary compensation formula.

## What this article is about

Repentance can be intense while leaving a simple question unanswered: what does the situation now require of me? Someone understands that they let another person down and keeps returning to the mistake. Yet feeling regret, acknowledging what happened, making amends, and receiving forgiveness belong to different parts of the situation. This article concerns the consequences still within reach: what can be named, clarified, repaired, or referred to someone entitled to decide. It brings together the story of Zacchaeus in Luke, the teaching about reconciliation in Matthew, and Aristotle’s account of deliberating about means. Their foundations differ; the comparison examines the structure of action rather than treating religious and philosophical teachings as identical. The proposed reflection cannot promise to restore a relationship. It helps distinguish one’s next action from another person’s response, a lost opportunity, and the demand to earn immediate emotional relief.

## I. A feeling does not yet describe the consequences

Consider an ordinary hypothetical situation. Someone promised a colleague some materials by a particular day, failed to check whether they were ready, and confidently confirmed the deadline. The materials arrived late. The colleague had to rearrange a schedule and explain the delay to other people. The person responsible now keeps saying how deeply ashamed they feel. Those words may be sincere, but they mainly describe that person’s condition. The colleague still does not know which version of the document is usable, who will notify everyone else, or whether a revised deadline can be trusted. Repair begins by turning from the intensity of one’s feelings to the particular consequences. Regret can prompt this attention rather than substitute for it.

It helps to distinguish three statements: I performed a particular action; it affected particular people; a particular task now remains. In this example, the first concerns an unverified promise, the second lost time and disrupted coordination, and the third usable materials and a



@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

clear notice. Compressing everything into “I ruined everything” hides the task behind a sweeping verdict. Saying only that everyone makes mistakes makes the harm disappear. Precision holds both sides together: the action was mine, and its consequences need not match what I find convenient to acknowledge. The description also remains open to correction by the person affected, who may know something about the situation that I failed to notice.

Not every regret concerns an event that memory can reliably reconstruct. Information may be incomplete, participants may remember things differently, and the connection between an action and a consequence may need clarification. Responsibility then begins with honestly identifying what is known and unknown rather than solemnly admitting every imaginable fault. One can acknowledge a promise and a delay without taking responsibility for every later difficulty in someone else’s life. One can hear about additional harm without rejecting it in advance or treating it as established before examining it. This care does not excuse the original action. It helps make repair answer the actual situation rather than a dramatic image someone has built around themselves.

## II. Acknowledgment addresses the person affected

Acknowledgment becomes meaningful when it has an object. Instead of a long account of one’s anxiety, one can name the promise that was not kept and the information supplied without verification. It then makes sense to ask about the consequences without turning the answer into a test of kindness. The other person may describe the inconvenience calmly, angrily, or briefly; they need not first reassure the person who made the mistake. In the hypothetical workplace example, “I confirmed readiness without checking it” says more than numerous assurances of good character. It opens a discussion of a specific correction without asking the listener to endorse my judgment of my entire personality.

Matthew 5:23–24 directs attention to a situation in which a brother has something against the person bringing a gift. The latter’s inward condition is not the only concern: there is a relationship that a pious act cannot simply bypass. The passage belongs to teaching about killing, anger, and reconciliation, rather than a modern guide to workplace correspondence. Its relevance here is the reminder that another participant exists. An outwardly worthy gesture does not make that person’s grievance disappear. The reader does not thereby acquire permission to arrange contact without consent, disregard an established distance, or demand immediate reconciliation. Applying the passage to an everyday situation remains a limited editorial comparison.

Meaningful acknowledgment also leaves the listener free not to enter a detailed conversation. A written clarification may be enough; they may not want to revisit the event; an authorized representative may be handling the matter. Responsibility is not measured by the number of direct contacts. Where a prohibition, danger, or required procedure exists, bypassing it for

personal relief is inappropriate. Someone can perform the part available through a permitted channel without securing a personal scene of forgiveness. This matters especially in unequal relationships: being required to hear a manager, relative, or former partner can become an additional burden. Acknowledgment should reduce uncertainty rather than make the other person manage my repentance.

## III. Wishing for the past and choosing the next action

Repentance often contains an impossible wish: that the event had never happened. The wish is understandable, but it does not supply a way to act. In Nicomachean Ethics III.2 Aristotle distinguishes wishing from choosing: one may wish even for the impossible, while choice concerns what one believes can be brought about through one's efforts. This promises neither that every desired result will become available nor that thinking correctly will make it so. The distinction clarifies the object. I may wish that my colleague had lost no time, but that time has passed. I can choose to prepare a usable document, verify the new deadline, and notify participants. The next action addresses the situation that actually exists.

III.3 makes the object of deliberation more precise: actions that can be performed and means toward an accepted end. An inward impulse is not enough; the manner of acting matters. If repair requires several people's coordination, access, or money, saying "I will try" cannot replace those conditions. Needing another person's participation does not turn their will into my tool. Aristotle's discussion of friends' assistance belongs to a particular philosophical account; in this article's application, each participant's consent remains an independent condition. Examining the means may reveal that a proposed method is unavailable. One must then reconsider it or acknowledge the limitation rather than confirm an impossible promise a second time.

Separating what is available from what is not does not mean choosing only easy actions. A possible action may require time, expense, acknowledgment before several people, and abandoning a convenient account of events. Difficulty does not make it impossible. Equally, intense regret does not establish that every desired result is achievable. Concrete questions help: what conditions are needed, which can I supply, and what requires agreement? The answer may be modest: correct the information today, deliver the materials tomorrow, discuss compensation later. A limited scale differs from evasion here. It makes a promise verifiable while leaving room to extend the action if another genuinely accessible part of the consequences becomes apparent.

## IV. Restitution should answer the particular harm

In Luke 19:1–10, Zacchaeus's encounter with Jesus accompanies a public declaration about giving to the poor and returning what was obtained through false accusation. The gesture concerns the material side of relationships: possessions do not disappear from consideration behind words about spiritual change. The narrative also culminates in a declaration of salvation and belongs to a Christian account. It supplies no universal compensation formula for this article's reader. Zacchaeus's fourfold return cannot automatically become a contemporary legal obligation or a measure of sufficient repentance. The narrower question is whether one can identify what was gained at another's expense and consider an available, agreed action concerning that gain.

Different consequences call for different corrections. False information should be corrected where it was communicated; retained property returned through a permitted means; unfinished work completed or honestly handed over. Money may be appropriate in one case and solve nothing in another. An attractive gift can distract from the task someone does not want to acknowledge. In the workplace example, the colleague may chiefly need verified materials and a notice to others, rather than an elaborate apology. To avoid deciding compensation alone, one can offer concrete alternatives and hear what actually matters. An offer remains an offer: the other person may refuse it or explain why it does not address the consequences.

Some consequences have no full equivalent. A lost day, missed encounter, or damaged trust does not become what it was after a transfer of money. Acknowledging this matters before promising to make everything right. Partial repair has value even when a remainder survives. Someone may return an item while recognizing that its prolonged absence affected another person's plans. They may correct information while acknowledging that the original mistake had already spread. This wording neither belittles the completed step nor treats it as payment for everything. It keeps reality in view: this particular part has been repaired, another remains, and deciding whether to discuss what follows does not belong to me alone.

## V. Repair does not purchase another person’s response

A subtle substitution occurs when someone performs a proper action with an unstated condition: now I must be forgiven. Returning something, correcting information, or completing work becomes a way to obtain the desired reaction. If it fails to arrive, resentment follows: I have done so much, yet the other person still remembers. Repair addresses the consequences of my action; forgiveness belongs to another person’s decision. Even accepted restitution does not establish renewed closeness. A colleague may acknowledge receipt of the materials and still change the terms of collaboration. This need not deny the effort. It may express their right to consider experience, verify deadlines, and choose workable conditions for future cooperation.

Aristotle’s account connects choice with one’s own action. Someone can decide to send an accurate notice; that same decision cannot determine its reception. This boundary is useful without treating every external circumstance as unimportant. Another person’s response matters, deserves attention, and may reveal that the proposed correction is mistaken. Its importance, however, does not place it at my disposal. If someone remains dissatisfied, I can clarify the particular unresolved issue. If they do not want a conversation, I can respect that refusal. Distinguishing action from result helps someone continue obligations without applying endless pressure for reassurance that they are good again and the event has finally been forgotten.

Giving up the purchase of forgiveness changes the language too. Instead of asking why someone is still angry after repair, one can report what has been done and ask whether a practical consequence remains overlooked. That question demands no emotional report. It leaves room for the person to say that the discussion is finished or more time is needed. Someone may grieve when a former relationship does not return, but this does not entitle them to withdraw restitution already made. A returned item was not payment for affection; a corrected document was not security for friendship. Both people retain dignity when responsibility and the freedom of response remain distinct. Continuing together is discussed only where both are actually willing to participate.

## VI. Shared responsibility does not erase my part

Sometimes several people contributed to a mistake. One failed to verify the deadline, another did not communicate a change, and a third circulated an outdated version. Trying to identify a sole culprit immediately can obstruct repair as much as the vague claim that things simply happened. It helps to name one’s part without appropriating the entire story or making acknowledgment conditional on everyone else admitting fault. The material still needs checking; recipients still need clarification. One can perform an action before the dispute about responsibility is settled when it genuinely belongs to oneself and does not dispose of another’s resources. A separate, honest examination can continue without appointing oneself the cause of everything.

Participation and authority also differ. Someone may be responsible for their message without being entitled to publish on behalf of the entire team. They may propose returning shared property without being entitled to change the storage agreement alone. The available part then includes contacting whoever can decide and supplying accurate information. This is a substantive step when repair requires it, but reporting to a manager does not establish that the task has been resolved. One needs to know who now holds the task and what remains one’s own responsibility. Otherwise repentance becomes another transfer of burden: I described the problem and stopped attending to whether the situation received any actual follow-through.

Access to means also depends on living conditions. People do not have equal money, time, safety, or opportunities to restore contact. An identical outward measure therefore does not establish equal good faith. A limitation should nevertheless be concrete: what is unavailable, what alternative can be offered, and what needs clarification? Someone may agree on gradual return, correct their own message, or retain information for a permitted referral. These are examples of deliberation rather than legal procedures. Where an obligatory process applies, its requirements should be established with the relevant competent participant. This article determines no debt, claims deadline, or right of contact; it examines one’s part within actual authority.

## VII. A renewed promise needs a verifiable form

After a mistake, it is tempting to promise unusually much: never to let anyone down again, always to be available, or to take everything on oneself. An emphatic promise may briefly reduce tension while creating another impossible obligation. Trust need not return through that scale of assurance. In the hypothetical workplace situation, it is more useful to state a verified deadline, identify the ready portion, and indicate what still depends on others. An unconfirmed deadline is information too. The revised procedure should address the identified error, such as confirming readiness only after checking the document. The change concerns a particular way of acting rather than proof of complete moral transformation in one conversation.

Aristotle’s discussion of means in III.3 draws attention to intermediate conditions. Intention and result are connected by a sequence: checking, agreeing, delivering, and confirming receipt. If a condition is absent, a later step may merely look like completion. Yet the sequence should not become endless planning that postpones a straightforward available action. Sufficient clarity means knowing the nearest action, a material limitation, and how its completion will be recognized. Action must then follow. In the example, one can correct the false confirmation today without first creating a perfect system for every future deadline. Useful organization differs from attempting to protect life completely against any recurrence of error.

Verifiability also helps prevent disagreement about what has been completed. One can identify the recipients of the correction and the version that is now valid. This is information about the task, not a report on the magnitude of repentance. Sometimes the correction itself will need correcting: another incorrect file or an overlooked participant may come to light. That is unpleasant, but it does not erase the earlier effort. Responsibility continues through attention to the particular object. This should not make every additional check permanently obligatory. Proportionate verification answers an identified risk and agreed scope; a particular mistake does not make someone accountable forever on every matter.

## VIII. When return is impossible

Some consequences concern a person with whom conversation is impossible: they have died, left the accessible circle, or established distance. A fantasy of a final conversation should not govern all subsequent life. One can acknowledge that a particular opportunity is lost and distinguish it from what remains. A retained item may be transferred under an established agreement; incorrect public information corrected without personal contact; a repeated way of acting discontinued. Helping a third person, however, does not automatically compensate the first. It can have independent value while retaining a limit: the particular past did not receive the response one now wishes to give it. A new worthy gesture should not conceal that remainder.

A religious understanding of repentance may include turning to God, confession, and forgiveness within a particular tradition. For a believer, this is more than a technique for relief. The article prescribes no religious practice to every reader and promises no outcome on a tradition's behalf. Zacchaeus's material gesture is connected with encounter and salvation; Aristotle discusses choice within an ethical account of character and action. Their foundations cannot be erased to produce a convenient general formula. Readers can retain their worldview while recognizing the difference between an available action and the impossibility of rewriting an event. The comparison requires neither abandoning faith, adopting another faith, nor treating what was lost as unimportant.

The limit of repair may feel like another fault: if everything cannot be restored, any action must be meaningless. This thought quietly demands impossible completeness from an available act. Correcting information still changes recipients' position; returned property is no longer retained; an agreed procedure may prevent a particular recurrence. These actions do not need to cancel the entire past in order to matter. The opposite inference is wrong as well: completing something does not make the remainder irrelevant. Both truths can be held together—the completed step is real, and the irretrievable remains irretrievable. The distinction supplies no permission to forget; it makes present responsibility possible without demanding the impossible.

## IX. Repentance does not define the whole person

Naming an action and naming a person have different scopes. Someone may have lied about work being ready; this does not supply complete knowledge of their life. Yet protecting a good name should not prevent them from naming the particular lie. Responsibility becomes clearer when acknowledgment requires neither total self-destruction nor blanket justification. One can say: I presented something unverified as established, and I am correcting it. The statement loses no force because it contains no humiliating label. It keeps the action visible while leaving room for the next choice. The person is not released from consequences, but need not turn every subsequent relationship into a trial of their whole identity.

This reasoning should not be imposed on another person's vulnerability as a ready-made explanation. The article cannot determine why someone cannot perform a proposed action, or make hesitation proof of a moral defect. Unclear circumstances, limited resources, fear of a reaction, or conflicting obligations may be involved. They need concrete examination. If distress seriously interferes with everyday life, a reader may seek appropriate support; no diagnosis or treatment programme is offered here. Support and responsibility need not exclude each other. Help may assist someone in seeing the situation more clearly without promising to remove every consequence or giving another person authority to decide for those affected.

Refusing to define oneself entirely through a mistake is not the declaration that one has already changed. Change appears in particular actions and may remain incomplete. Someone can notify a recipient more accurately today, notice an old habit tomorrow, and later request a check where they previously spoke without one. This is neither a timetable of moral growth nor a promise of linear improvement. What matters is the actual connection between the discovered error and a revised form of participation. Others may notice it, overlook it, or assess it differently. One can continue the correction without a performance of proof while accepting specific feedback. No single bad or good act completes a person’s identity; each particular act can still be answered for.

## X. The completed part and the open remainder

Repair needs the possibility of completing a particular task. If a document has been verified and received, that fact can be acknowledged. If an item has been returned, it need not be discussed forever as though it were still retained. Completion requires neither general vindication nor renewed intimacy. It means that a particular matter has a clear state. In the workplace example, participants can close the transfer of materials separately from deciding how future collaboration will work. This helps both: a completed step does not vanish into perpetual accusation, and an unresolved issue is not hidden behind “done.” No one must accept another person’s unilateral declaration that the entire history is finished.

An open remainder can be named without promising to close it immediately. Trust has not returned; an additional loss is still unclear; a former encounter is no longer possible. Each statement has different implications. One calls for time and consent, another for clarification, and a third for acknowledgment of a limit. Compressing everything into an unlimited debt leaves someone unsure what to do. Compressing it into one completed act hides another side of the situation. A brief account can therefore identify what is established, what is done, what remains unknown or unavailable, and who can decide next. It is no certificate of moral purity. It helps participants understand the actual state of their shared history.

Repentance gains practical depth when it becomes more than someone’s relationship with themselves. It turns toward the action, the person affected, and existing possibilities. The Gospel passages retain their religious foundations; Aristotelian choice retains its place in ethics. A limited comparison reveals a boundary: one can deliberate about and perform a next action, but the same effort cannot appoint another person’s forgiveness or cancel what happened. The accessible part of the consequences may be small, difficult, or dependent on several participants. Its meaning is not determined by the volume of promises. It depends on whether the action addresses the actual matter, respects the conditions of participation, and leaves visible what has not yet been repaired.

## What this means in practice

Choose one particular situation that is safe and appropriate to consider now. This is an invitation to reflect, not an obligation to contact someone immediately. Describe the event without a sweeping judgment of yourself: what you did or communicated, what is established about the consequences, and what needs clarification. Identify separately the people whose decisions you cannot make for them.

Next, distinguish the impossible wish to restore the past from one available action. Perhaps you need to correct information, return an item, complete your work, or contact an authorized participant. Specify the means, consent, a material limitation, and a sign of completion. Do not promise full restitution where it has not been established. If contact is prohibited, dangerous, or unwanted, do not bypass that condition for relief.

After performing the step, briefly note what changed and what remains open. Acceptance of your action does not establish forgiveness; the absence of forgiveness does not erase its actual result. If no permitted step is apparent, an honest account of the limitation is better than an invented measure. Do not turn this note into a daily trial of yourself. Its purpose is orientation in a particular situation and attention to the available part of responsibility while preserving the other person’s rights.

## Key quotation

> *We deliberate about things that are in our power and can be done…*

— Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics III.3, translated by W. D. Ross. Ellipsis marks omitted continuation; the passage concerns the scope of deliberation.

## Connections between traditions

1. **Returning property and choosing a possible means.** Zacchaeus in Luke 19:8 declares a particular material response to what was obtained through false accusation; Aristotle in Nicomachean Ethics III.3 describes deliberation about possible actions and means. The shared mechanism is a move from general orientation to a specific act. The limit: the Gospel’s return belongs to a narrative of salvation, while philosophical deliberation establishes no religious forgiveness; the amount in the narrative is no contemporary rule.

2. **Another person’s grievance and the boundary of choice.** Matthew 5:23–24 keeps the brother with a grievance in view even while a gift is being offered. Aristotle III.2 distinguishes one’s choice from a wished-for external outcome. The comparison separates attention to a real grievance from demanding a desired response. The limit: reconciliation supplies no right to

bypass refusal of contact, and choosing one's act does not control another person's forgiveness.

3. **A declaration and the conditions of performance.** Luke 19:8 identifies recipients and the object of material action; Aristotle III.3 examines a sequence of means and limits on the feasibility of a proposed method. The connection is that a promise gains substance when its object and manner are visible. The limit: the narrative is no audit of every payment, and philosophical analysis does not prove a particular plan completed; this article verifies performance separately from declaration.

4. **The relationship's priority and a substitute gesture.** In Matthew 5:23–24, a gift cannot bypass an unresolved relationship; in Aristotle III.3, a sought means must answer the accepted end. The shared mechanism is that a gesture worthy in itself may fail to address the task for which it is chosen. The limit: the religious sequence of gift and reconciliation is more than task management, and philosophical suitability of means does not exhaust the Christian teaching.

5. **An impossible wish and the next real part.** Aristotle III.2 allows wishing for the impossible while distinguishing it from choice; the particular return in Luke 19:8 addresses an existing object rather than cancelling an earlier event. The connection permits acknowledging loss without abandoning an available act. The limit: this is an editorial structural comparison, not a claim that Luke teaches Aristotelian psychology; partial repair establishes neither complete restitution nor restored relationships.

## Primary sources

1. **Gospel according to Luke.** Luke 19:1–10, especially 19:8. King James Version, Bible Gateway. The complete selected passage and KJV label were read. Material return belongs to the account of encounter and salvation; it does not replace contemporary clarification of rights and obligations.

2. **Aristotle.** Nicomachean Ethics III.2–3. English translation by W. D. Ross, Internet Classics Archive. The selected sections on wish, choice, and means were read completely. Historical statements about health and bodily conditions beyond the adopted topic are not used as contemporary recommendations.

3. **Gospel according to Matthew.** Matthew 5:21–26, especially 5:23–24. King James Version, Bible Gateway. The full selected context of anger, reconciliation, and offering was read; no right to demand contact or forgiveness is inferred.

The named English translations of ancient texts were used. Displayed Russian quotations are United Wisdom's own translations; the article's remaining formulations are original editorial exposition. The primary works are not efficacy studies of the suggested reflection.

## Tags

repentance, repair, consequences, responsibility, acknowledgment, restitution, forgiveness, reconciliation, choice, Aristotle, Zacchaeus, Gospel, Luke, Matthew, available action, wish, means, consent, boundaries, trust, promise, precision, harm, relationships, partial repair, return, loss, participation, verification, meaning

## 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.