

UNITED WISDOM

Personal memory worth preserving

Meaning and Direction

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

P-18-N03 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Personal memory worth preserving

Epigraph

fields and roomy chambers of memory

— Augustine, Confessions X.8.12, exact fragment; J.G. Pilkington translation, New Advent revision.

What this article is about

Preserving personal memory need not mean collecting everything that has happened. Sometimes choosing a few witnesses and explaining why they matter is more useful than compiling a complete archive. A photograph, a short account, or a place name can maintain a connection with particular experience without becoming an entire biography. Yet selection asks us to distinguish an event, our recollection, something heard from others, and our present interpretation. This article considers those distinctions through an ordinary fictional example, Augustine, Montaigne, and a biblical instruction about memory. It concerns the meaning of a preserved witness rather than a health assessment, recovery of every detail, or an obligation to revisit painful experiences. People included in an account retain lives and voices of their own; the person preserving a memory acquires no authority to speak for them in every respect.

I. Choosing a memory rather than proving completeness

When someone opens a box of old possessions, quantity can easily become the first measure of value. Leaving an object undescribed may seem to mean losing another piece of a life. Yet the amount preserved does not automatically equal the meaning made available. A hundred similar photographs may communicate less than one photograph with an understandable explanation. This does not dismiss a large collection. It restores the question of purpose: what does this person want to keep available for themselves or for a particular reader? The answer might concern a family occasion, a familiar place, a decision, or quiet help that seemed ordinary when it was received. Selection gains substance when the object of attention is named, instead of being governed solely by fear of failing to retain something.

Imagine Nika sorting photographs from a move. She chooses a picture of a kitchen table. There is no celebration in it, only cups, a bag of bread, and a neighbour beside the window. What matters to Nika is the evening when people first managed to eat quietly together in a house that was still unsettled. The photograph itself establishes none of this. It helps her name experience she wishes to preserve: someone’s modest assistance made a new place usable

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

for ordinary life. She need not declare that evening the central event of her destiny. Explaining its particular significance is enough. Other photographs may remain without an accompanying story; that decision alone demonstrates neither ingratitude nor an absence of feeling.

In To the Reader, Montaigne gives his self-description a limited subject and his writing a particular personal purpose. That literary undertaking supplies no ready-made rule for choosing photographs. It reveals another possibility: an account need not defend an entire life before an imagined tribunal. It may have a particular measure and audience. The question “Have I preserved enough?” can therefore be connected with “Enough for what kind of understanding?” If the selected object helps someone name an experience and its limits, the task has already acquired a form. Incompleteness remains a feature of the account, but it does not automatically become a defect or the writer’s moral guilt.

II. An image does not contain the whole event

A photograph provides a particular image rather than a whole evening with its causes and consequences. It can show where people and objects were placed. Without additional testimony it cannot establish every intention, conversation, or feeling. Nika remembers that the neighbour brought bread. In the picture the bag stands beside somebody else, which does not establish whose action it was. When an account is added to an image, later explanation should not be presented as something immediately visible. A short clarification can preserve the distinction: the photograph shows certain things, while the next paragraph offers the writer’s recollection of that evening. Readers can then understand more clearly what supports each part of the account.

In Confessions X.8.13, Augustine distinguishes things from the images available in memory. What is absent can be recalled, but it is not in memory in the same way that a thing stands before a person. This philosophical movement is not a contemporary account of how the brain operates. Here it sustains a narrower question: are we attributing the presence of an entire event to a preserved image? A photograph’s caption also remains somebody’s words rather than the past transported intact. It can be valued without being required to do the impossible. Words help people orient themselves within experience. They do not return every participant to the original circumstances or remove the distance between that time and present reading.

This distinction does not require treating every preserved object with constant suspicion. It allows more precise use of what is available. A person can indicate a place and approximate time, name people they recognise, and explain separately what stayed with them. Where the date is uncertain, retaining that uncertainty is preferable to giving it the appearance of exact knowledge. If somebody at the edge of the frame cannot be identified, the gap need not receive a name merely to make the story look complete. A witness can have real value within

these boundaries. Its trustworthiness here concerns honesty about the scope offered, rather than an outward impression that the writer can answer every question about the past.

III. Distinguishing recollection from present interpretation

An event, its recollection, and its present meaning are connected, but they are different subjects of discussion. Nika may remember that the table was quiet. Today she understands that quietness as relief after the move. She need not assume that this interpretation is mistaken; she should recognise that it is being made now. Another participant might have connected the quietness with exhaustion or care for a child in the next room. Personal significance can be named without asserting that the evening meant the same thing to everybody present. A preserved account becomes more precise when words about actions can be distinguished from words about the meaning the writer now gives them.

In X.8.14, Augustine discusses remembered experience of his own and what became known through other people’s testimony. This is no ready-made classification table for a modern family archive. Yet the origins of knowledge matter in ordinary accounts too. Nika was at the table herself. She heard later about how the neighbour had previously helped other residents of that house. These items can appear together if their relationship is identified. Readers need not then assume that everything was personally observed by the writer. “I was told” can sometimes provide more clarity than a detailed, confident scene composed from others’ words and silently turned into an apparent personal recollection.

Every paragraph need not become a cumbersome explanation of every imaginable uncertainty. Significant transitions are enough: this I saw, this I recall indistinctly, this I heard, and this is how I understand it now. Such a form leaves room for later clarification. Another account need not destroy the whole earlier text. It may change a date, add a circumstance, or reveal a different meaning. The writer is not forced to choose between complete infallibility and abandoning all testimony. Personal memory remains an available account from an identified position. It can encounter other testimony without having to reject it beforehand in order to protect the writer’s dignity.

IV. Keeping your voice without taking over another’s

Other people are often present in personal memory. Without them it may be difficult to explain why an evening, a conversation, or assistance mattered. Yet a first-person account does not turn another person’s inner life into the writer’s possession. Nika can say that the neighbour’s help was significant to her. This does not establish what final meaning the action had for the neighbour herself. An attributed intention can quietly turn somebody into a convenient role: rescuer, culprit, model of selflessness, or cause of every later difficulty. That role may make a well-organised story while having little support in the available witness. Preserving memory does not require such completion of another person’s image.

The practical distinction is simple, although it may not be easy. A person can describe help received and their own response while leaving an unknown intention open. They can report words that were actually preserved without making those words stand for the speaker’s entire personality. If the other person offers an explanation, it can have its own place instead of merely confirming a version already chosen by the writer. This matters particularly when an account is intended for a shared circle. Preserved memory need not become a collective verdict. A participant may agree that the gathering happened while describing its significance differently; this is not automatically an attack on Nika’s right to remember her own experience.

Montaigne’s limited subject of self-description helps raise the question of a voice’s boundaries. It proves no objective literary portrait and settles no contemporary privacy question for us. Its use here is narrower: writers can identify what they are offering testimony about. “This is how I remember receiving help” differs from “This is the complete truth about the person who helped.” The first can be meaningful and honest without becoming the second. Personal memory then preserves an encounter between people rather than simply collecting material for a single central hero. Others’ independence remains part of the reality acknowledged by the account, even where it cannot be fully described.

V. Ordinary care also has a place in memory

What deserves preserving need not have been a conspicuous achievement. Meaning can lie in how somebody helped others live with ordinary circumstances: remembering a meeting time, bringing something needed, or listening without rushing to a conclusion. Such actions easily disappear from an account organised solely around successes and turning points. They can be named without requiring every small thing to become a great event. For Nika, the significance of bread and cups belongs to a particular evening rather than a general sermon about good people. The preserved detail shows the work or presence that she came to see more clearly. This is attention to something specific, rather than a competition for the most elevated recollection.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Deuteronomy 4:9–10 connects remembrance of what was seen with teaching the next generation about a particular event at Horeb. God, the words heard, and their covenantal grounds remain present in the text. The passage cannot be turned into a rule requiring everyone to record every private experience. The comparison helps ask a different question: why is this witness being passed on, and what meaning would be lost without context? Nika's answer can remain personal and secular. She wants to show that making a new home usable involved more than her independence; available assistance mattered too. That significance does not make an ordinary evening into a new biblical event.

Grateful memory need not hide a relationship's complexity. The neighbour may have helped that evening and later disagreed with Nika about something else. A flawless image and erasure of the assistance are not the only choices. A particular action retains significance within its own measure. It excuses no later harm and does not turn the recipient into a permanent debtor. Where the account preserves a specific contribution, it can be understood without a conclusion about someone's whole character. Memory of care need not become a demand for loyalty. Other events remain available for discussion on their own grounds, using the testimony that is actually available about them.

VI. A gap can remain identified

Nika wants to remember exactly what the neighbour said at the table. She recalls a calm tone confidently, but no verbatim sentence remains available to her. It is tempting to choose words that express her present understanding of the evening and write them as a line spoken in the past. The account would become smoother while acquiring false precision. Another approach is possible: describe the impression of the conversation and leave its words unknown. This does not make the evening meaningless. An honest paraphrase of general content, a present formulation of one's own, and an actually preserved quotation should be distinguished. Each has a place if it does not pretend to be another merely to make the scene persuasive or neatly complete.

In X.8.12, Augustine describes differing availability of remembered images: some arrive immediately, others require a longer search, and still others interrupt it. His figurative account belongs to reflection on a person's relation to self and God. It establishes no cause for a particular contemporary person's difficulty recalling something and offers no guaranteed way to recover a missing detail. For this article, what matters is not demanding more from an available recollection than it contains. A gap cannot be filled with an assertion that enough effort will necessarily produce the desired detail. The person preserving memory may end an account where their knowledge ends, even if that limit looks less impressive than a complete answer.

If another witness or a record is available, clarification can be considered as a separate possibility. It need not become an endless investigation of every ordinary episode. A specific question can be asked while recognising that its answer may also be limited. The aim is clarity about the origins of added information rather than victory for one’s version. If Nika’s sister remembers a different day, the discrepancy can be noted alongside the earlier date. Not every disagreement will be resolved, and not every difference changes the central significance of the selected account. A meaningful evening can be preserved with an approximate time without making uncertainty over one number a reason to reject everything else or blame every disagreeing witness.

VII. Not everything important requires an open account

Personal significance and openness to others are different questions. Someone may regard an episode as important while not wishing to describe it in detail for now. They might leave a neutral caption, keep an account for a particular circle, or avoid turning the recollection into a document at all. This does not establish that their memory is insufficiently honest. What matters need not be available to everybody. Where an account includes information about another person, a further question arises: which part can the writer properly present as personal experience, and which was received in a confidential conversation? Attention to that boundary is more useful than a general rule of complete disclosure in the name of supposedly authentic memory.

Preservation is not identical with publication. Even a simple account kept at home can be intended for different degrees of availability. This article provides no legal determination about specific documents or other people’s data. It suggests identifying the intention first: who is the account for, what does it disclose, and whose life will be affected by its transmission? Sometimes asking a participant helps avoid attributing a desired openness to them. Sometimes restricting a detail or choosing another way to name personal significance is preferable. A decision need not secure complete agreement about everything, but it should recognise the real difference between a person’s account of their own life and the other lives that account involves.

Where a recollection concerns painful experience, this article imposes no requirement to live through it again in order to complete a task correctly. Choosing a small available witness, postponing the work, or declining a detailed account remain possible decisions. Neither Augustine nor Montaigne is used here as evidence that writing has a therapeutic effect. Personal memory is no examination of courage, gratitude, or spiritual maturity. A person may acknowledge an event’s significance without immediately making it the main subject of discussion. The account’s limits can then reflect a chosen scope of attention and actual circumstances rather than a need to declare every silence a failure.

VIII. Explanation gives an object its place

An object without explanation may retain its form while losing an understandable connection with a life. Nika recognises the kitchen-table photograph because she took part in the evening. Another reader need not know about the move, the absence of familiar possessions, or the neighbour’s assistance. A short caption can make the connection available. It can name what is shown, what context is known, and why this particular image was selected. There is no need to write the complete history of the house or every participant. A few specific sentences may provide more understanding than a ceremonial declaration that an entire era is contained in the photograph. The explanation’s scale can match the experience available rather than the grandeur of a chosen literary form.

Suppose Nika writes three parts: the approximate time and place, her recollection of bread being brought, and her present understanding of why the evening matters. This sequence is no mandatory form for every archive. In this instance it helps avoid mixing different grounds. A reader asking about the date can see its uncertainty. Someone asking about the assistance can understand who is testifying to it. A reader who does not share the writer’s meaning can discuss that interpretation instead of having to dispute the entire account at once. Explanation makes questions more precise. It guarantees neither a future reader’s interest nor their preservation of the object, nor the same feeling that Nika experiences.

Explanation should also be distinguished from final justification. The writer can name significance they see now while leaving room to reconsider it. In X.8.15, Augustine does not regard a person as fully comprehending their own memory. This limit does not prohibit speaking; it prevents one account from becoming exhaustive self-knowledge. Nika can write that today she sees the evening as an experience of accepting assistance. Later she may notice something else or keep that interpretation. The preserved version will remain a witness from a particular time. It need not pretend to be final in order to deserve attention, and it need not disappear merely because later understanding became broader.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

IX. Another account can stand beside yours

When Nika’s sister reads the caption, she recalls that the bread arrived earlier and that the evening was not the first shared supper. The disagreement can be examined through separate questions. Does the date need changing? Does the assistance cease to matter? Or does only the elevated word “first” change because Nika could not support it adequately? Clarification need not become a struggle for ownership of the past. Sometimes an account retains its significance after a small correction while becoming less confident about one detail. Sometimes a substantial error calls for more substantial reconsideration. The decision depends on what proved mistaken or disputed, rather than a general requirement either to defend or to reject one’s memory in every case.

Two clearly identified versions may remain alongside each other where there are insufficient grounds for a final choice. This does not assert that every account is equally accurate. Witnesses have different support, and a record discovered later may clarify a particular question. Where a question remains unresolved, however, preference should not be presented as an established result. The sister may connect the same table with exhaustion after chores, while Nika connects it with receiving assistance. These meanings need not exclude each other. They belong to different participants’ experience even if they concern one room and evening. Personal memory can preserve a person’s experience while acknowledging that it does not exhaust what happened for everybody.

Montaigne’s personal voice and Augustine’s distinction between firsthand experience and what was heard help maintain the narrator’s position. Neither source establishes equality among all versions or cancels factual clarification. Their comparison here is limited: a witness has an author and a scope worth making visible. If Nika adds her sister’s note, it can remain an independent addition. She need not rewrite it to express only her own feelings. Preserved memory can then become a place for an available conversation. It requires no shared final portrait of every participant and does not appoint one person the owner of every permissible meaning of the event.

X. Finishing the witness you chose can be enough

Work on personal memory can remain finite. One photograph, a few explanatory sentences, and identified limits already constitute a particular witness. A person need not immediately expand it into a complete family or life history. Sometimes limitation makes the completed work visible: the selected evening can now be understood through available words rather than only through the writer’s unspoken knowledge. A second step does not arise automatically from the first. Another object can be approached later, another genre chosen, or this small account left independent. Completion concerns the selected task rather than an eventual ability to retain the entire past without losses, questions, or disagreements.

What is preserved can matter without a promise of everlasting existence. This article offers no instructions about the durability of storage media and no guarantee of future interest. Its question is different: which memory is a person making more understandable now? Nika does not know whether the photograph will matter to the next reader. She knows why she chose to explain it and what she can actually assert in that explanation. This measure allows action under uncertainty. An unknown response does not erase the present witness’s value, but it does not become a right to demand recognition from others either. An account can be offered while preserving the distinction between personal intention and what another person later does with it.

Augustine, Montaigne, and Deuteronomy belong to different historical and interpretive worlds. Their approaches to memory cannot be assembled into one system binding on everybody. Yet particular distinctions within them help avoid confusing an image with an event, personal witness with complete knowledge, and transmission of meaning with authority over the future. Personal memory worth preserving is then defined by something other than the overall magnitude of a life. It is a chosen witness whose writer can name its significance, available grounds, and limits. It may contain joy, difficulty, ordinary help, or an unfinished question. Honesty within its measure is enough, while living people retain room beside the preserved account.

What this means in practice

If you wish to try, choose one available witness: a photograph, an object, or a short episode that has particular significance now. There is no need to search for the most important moment of your entire life. Name what you chose and why before enlarging the task.

Identify known circumstances, your recollection, and present interpretation separately. If a significant detail is unknown, leave it unknown. Where other people participate in the account, consider which parts you witness yourself, what you heard from them, and who the writing is intended for.

A few understandable sentences can finish the task. Preserving them entails no obligation to publish, produce a complete biography, or relive painful experience. If you wish, return later, clarify the account on available grounds, or leave it within the scope you selected. This small step promises no therapeutic result. It simply makes a particular witness and its boundaries more available.

Key quotation

> *things which thine eyes have seen*

— Deuteronomy 4:9, exact fragment; King James Version.

Connections between traditions

1. **An image does not become a complete event.** Augustine, Confessions X.8.13, distinguishes absent things from images available to memory; Deuteronomy 4:9 addresses witness to what was seen. The shared question concerns what someone can offer as experience without attributing an entire event’s presence to a preserved image. Boundary: Christian philosophical reflection and covenantal instruction form no common theory of memory. The biblical text confirms no ordinary photograph’s accuracy, and Augustine’s distinction supplies no contemporary test of recollection’s reliability.

2. **An account’s origins remain visible.** Augustine X.8.14 distinguishes personal experience from information received through others; Montaigne’s To the Reader gives personal witness a limited subject. The shared mechanism identifies the narrator’s position: where they participated, what they heard, and what they understand now. Boundary: sincerity does not automatically establish factual accuracy. Literary self-description is no complete objective biography. The specific translator of the English Montaigne address has not been established, so it is used through paraphrase without a displayed quotation.

3. **Transmission needs an identified context.** Deuteronomy 4:9–10 connects teaching children with Horeb, God, and words heard; Montaigne’s To the Reader identifies his address’s particular purpose and readership. The comparison asks why a chosen witness is offered to this reader and what would remain unclear without context. Boundary: covenant is not reduced to a family archive, and a writer’s personal intention gains no authority of religious commandment. Not every private experience must be recorded and passed to the next generation.

4. **Selected memory does not exhaust a person.** Augustine X.8.15 recognises that he cannot fully comprehend his own memory; Montaigne’s To the Reader limits description to an ordinary personal appearance rather than public adornment. The shared mechanism keeps an account within its measure: a particular witness can be finished without producing a final portrait of an

entire life. Boundary: a philosophical limit to self-understanding is no clinical assessment, and Montaigne's address proves no perfect sincerity. Incompleteness neither makes all versions equally accurate nor cancels possible factual clarification.

5. **Attention guarantees no complete recovery.** Augustine X.8.12 describes differing availability of images and interference from other recollections; Deuteronomy 4:9 calls for attention to significant witness within its covenantal context. The shared question supports keeping explanation that identifies an account's subject and grounds instead of filling every gap with confident words. Boundary: neither passage establishes writing's health benefits or an ability to recover every detail. No requirement to relive painful experience is imposed here, and religious instruction does not become a universal method of archiving.

Primary sources

Augustine, **Confessions X.8, paragraphs 12–15**, the complete named passage; J.G. Pilkington's translation in Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, First Series, Volume 1, edited by Philip Schaff, 1887, revised for New Advent by Kevin Knight. Used for things and images, firsthand and reported experience, availability of recollections, and limits to self-understanding. The epigraph is a fragment of X.8.12; its Russian rendering is ours. Christian orientation towards God remains present. The figurative account supplies neither neuroscience nor a clinical test or guaranteed recovery of details. Source text.

Deuteronomy 4:9–10, King James Version, the entire named passage about what was seen, teaching children, Horeb, and God's words heard. The key quotation is a short fragment of 4:9; its Russian rendering is ours. Covenantal grounds are not replaced with a secular technique. The passage imposes no obligation to archive every private experience and establishes no writing-related memory or health benefit. Source text.

Michel de Montaigne, **To the Reader**, in Essays, William Carew Hazlitt's 1877 edition, Project Gutenberg ebook 3600: the complete address with editorial notes. The book names Charles Cotton as translator, but the address is marked "Omitted by Cotton"; its specific English translator has not been established. It is used through brief paraphrase of limited personal self-description, without a displayed quotation or Cotton attribution for this fragment. Date variants are not resolved, historical assumptions about "primitive" peoples are not adopted, and the resource proves no fully objective self-portrait. Source text.

Tags

memory, witness, recollection, photograph, account, experience, event, image, significance, interpretation, context, personal history, Augustine, Montaigne, Deuteronomy, care, gratitude, voice, participant, uncertainty, detail, privacy, choice, boundary, clarification, conversation, honesty, incompleteness, attention, preservation

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.