

UNITED WISDOM

Why We Make Room for Tragedy

Meaning and Direction

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

P-19-N01 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Why We Make Room for Tragedy

Epigraph

The weight of this sad time

— William Shakespeare, King Lear 5.3.392, Folger through-line 3642. A fragment of Edgar’s concluding speech, original English.

What this article is about

Why read or watch a story that promises no fortunate ending? One person seeks a serious account of choice; another wants to hear something ordinary conversation rarely accommodates. Someone else will prefer a different genre, and that preference is legitimate. The question becomes more useful when a difficult response is not made a compulsory stage of maturity. This article considers what tragic form may offer an attentive reader: distinctions between action and outcome, recognition of what cannot be undone, sympathy without acquittal, and speech without ready reassurance. Particular passages from Aristotle, Shakespeare and the Book of Job help frame these questions. Their genres, historical grounds and religious horizons differ. They are neither a single doctrine nor evidence of art’s therapeutic power. The contemporary situations below are invented for reflection. Tragedy can become a significant encounter with a work; it is not necessary for everyone, and it does not make actual suffering valuable by definition.

I. A story that need not make us happy

“Tragedy” can name an artistic work or a devastating event. The uses touch without becoming identical. A work arranges a beginning, an order of scenes, the duration of a pause and a stopping point. An actual misfortune owes nobody an expressive arrangement and does not exist for an audience. Interest in tragic art therefore needs to be distinguished from an attitude towards another person’s loss. We can value the precision of a dramatic scene without wishing its event upon anyone. Nor can harm be justified because it might eventually produce a powerful story. The artistic value of a representation adds nothing to the permissibility of the represented act.

Imagine returning to a familiar play while remembering its ending. Surprise no longer provides the main reason to read. Attention can move towards a warning, an attempted objection or a decision that was still open. Events in the work will not change. The question changes instead: waiting for rescue gives way to examining how people act before the outcome. Such reading guarantees no wisdom beyond the book. It provides a particular task within an encounter with

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

the text. Someone who finds no interest in that task, or does not want to undertake it, need not continue merely because the work has an established reputation.

Another reason to approach tragedy may be fatigue with obligatory rewards. A reader wants to consider a situation in which an admirable act does not inevitably receive external confirmation. This does not make fortunate endings superficial. It identifies a different question: what deserves attention when success cannot certify rightness? Mood alone cannot answer it. We need to examine the work’s presentation of action, consequences and the people who bear them. Choosing a genre can resemble choosing a subject for conversation. One subject matters today and another tomorrow. A personal preference does not become a measure of everyone else’s maturity or seriousness.

II. How actions become distinguishable

In Poetics VI Aristotle gives the arrangement of action a central place; XIV distinguishes effects of construction from spectacle. This is an ancient genre prescription, not a rule for every modern production. For our question, the distinction matters: distressing content alone cannot explain a work’s interest. Readers can ask whether decisions connect with consequences, whether objection remains possible, and whether those harmed are represented. These are questions for our own judgment. Accepting them does not require accepting every preference of the philosopher. We can distinguish a sequence of actions from a series of images whose intensity is treated as sufficient justification for showing them.

In an imagined play, a leader conceals a letter to protect influence. A second person makes a decision without knowing its contents; a third bears the consequences. Saying merely that everyone made mistakes would erase significant differences. Who possessed the information? Who was entitled to withhold it? What possibility remained for the later agent? A tragic arrangement can make this sequence visible without turning it into a problem with one correct solution. Responsibility can be distinguished while acknowledging that not every outcome was under anyone’s control. This calls for attention to transitions between scenes, rather than choosing whichever sufferer appears most compelling or attractive.

An ending can also alter our impression of a beginning. Once the outcome is known, an earlier warning may appear obvious, although it competed with other information at the time. Judgment needs to return to what was available then. This excuses no decision automatically: an agent may have ignored adequate grounds. But those grounds must be found in the scene rather than carried backwards from the ending. At a particular point readers can know more than a character does. That advantage deserves acknowledgment instead of becoming evidence of our superiority. Precision depends on preserving the difference between later clarity and an earlier opportunity to choose.

III. Sympathy without a verdict on worth

When someone in a story suffers, readers may immediately ask whether the suffering was deserved. Sometimes this concerns responsibility for a particular act; sometimes it quietly expands into a verdict on an entire life. The outcome is then made a complete assessment of the person. Yet acknowledging pain endorses no previous act, and condemning an act does not make every subsequent loss deserved. Sympathy can have a particular object: loss, fear or the inability to say goodbye. It need not issue a general certificate of innocence. Literary discussion can then make room for both moral evaluation and attention to what that evaluation does not remove.

Imagine a character who rudely rejected assistance and now receives devastating news. The earlier refusal can be criticised for its treatment of those offering help. The pain of the present news can also be acknowledged. The statements do not conflict unless one is used to cancel the other. Lost trust need not be restored, and another character need not be required to forgive immediately. A reader’s sympathy has no authority over other people’s relationships. It expresses a more modest willingness to keep the represented person from collapsing into one convenient description. Questions of safety, consent and possible future contact remain distinct from that willingness.

The reverse temptation is to treat an intense response as proof of the spectator’s goodness. An impression is not an action. An attentive reader can be an inattentive listener; strong emotion after a scene certifies nothing automatically. Discussion is more useful when it concerns the reading we can describe: what distinction did we notice, whose speech had we overlooked, which hasty judgment might we qualify? These are accessible questions, unlike awarding ourselves moral credit for tears. Even a clear answer belongs to one encounter with a text. Its possible significance elsewhere remains to be considered separately, without promising a lasting transformation of character or conduct.

IV. What a resolution cannot repair

In the ending of King Lear, 5.3, a late order for rescue does not restore Cordelia; death remains among attempts to arrange what follows. This particular dramatic situation is no law about the futility of action. It suggests a distinction between changing a decision and removing all its consequences. Our own question is whether a story can acknowledge an act undertaken too late without making acknowledgment restore what was lost. Both parts matter. A further action can exist beside something that cannot be recovered. Keeping only one part would produce either a convenient erasure of the past or an excessive claim that nothing now matters.

In an imagined story, someone publicly corrects a false statement, but its subject has already lost an important opportunity. Correction can still be necessary: it stops repetition and changes

later decisions. Calling it complete restitution would nevertheless be inaccurate. The distinction between necessary and sufficient helps us discuss the scene without falling into either extreme. A present action can have both value and a limit. The person harmed need not declare the story finished to relieve somebody else's moral discomfort. Nor should a reader demand that ending merely because it is difficult to remain with the discrepancy between remorse and restoration of what was lost.

"Irreversible" also needs precision. It may describe one circumstance rather than every possibility available to a person. A literary episode cannot bring back someone who has died, while decisions of the living remain. Spoken words cannot be unspoken, while repetition can stop and their addressee can be acknowledged. Those remaining choices need not become optimistic compensation. It is enough to identify what is closed and what has not yet been determined. The distinction respects loss without granting it authority to describe every possibility in a single word. It matters when a wish to reassure, or to sound severe, begins to outrun attention to the work's actual events.

V. Speech that has not become an answer

Job 3 contains lament and questioning; its closing words do not turn them into calm assent. This is religious speech, not a separate stage tragedy. The comparison concerns the place of an unresolved utterance. It neither removes references to God nor converts it into universal philosophy. Our question is whether a reader can hear difficult speech without immediately correcting it into a convenient conclusion. Retaining a question in reading does not make every utterance a guide to action. It first identifies what is said, and in what situation, before proposing a meaning the speaker has not expressed in that particular passage.

Imagine a discussion in which someone says that a character's unanswered speech was especially troubling. Another participant quickly explains how that character ought to have viewed the situation. This may be an interesting later subject, but it has displaced the first one. A question about the presence of a listener has been replaced by an evaluation of the speaker. Discussion can return to the scene: who was present, who could answer, and what words were actually spoken? Participants need not disclose personal experiences or become objects of instruction. The conversation remains a shared examination of the work, allowing different questions and different paces of moving between them.

Silence in an artistic discussion does not always mean agreement, wisdom or the permanent absence of an answer. A play can leave a pause, a story can break off a scene, and a reader can lack suitable words. Each situation has its own grounds. Description is better than giving silence one universal meaning. Sometimes a question remains open because the work supplies no answer. Sometimes an answer is offered but seems unconvincing. Sometimes the relevant episode has not yet been examined. These distinctions make reading more precise. We can

leave a thought unfinished without concluding that speech is futile or that a mandatory meaning hides behind every pause.

VI. The distance between a scene and our lives

A work offers a particular distance: events are presented through language, images or performance, while the reader occupies another position. Form alone nevertheless makes no impression easy or suitable for everyone. Someone can close the book, leave a discussion or choose a different work. Enduring a scene need not become an examination. It is more useful to consider the conditions of an encounter: is the kind of content known, can a pause be taken, and can the text be discussed without personal disclosure? These questions concern available choice. Answering them requires neither comparison with other people’s responses nor a compulsory standard of sensitivity.

The depth of participation can also be chosen. One reader studies construction, another follows a particular question, and a third currently wants a brief account. These approaches differ in task: a summary does not replace close attention to language. Yet that difference establishes no hierarchy of human worth. Participants can state what each is examining without claiming reading beyond that scope. A shared emotional pace is unnecessary. Someone interested in composition need not perform an intense response, while someone affected by a line need not immediately produce a comprehensive analysis. Conditions of participation become clearer; the work remains a common subject approached from different directions.

The boundary between examining a fictional situation and requiring its personal reproduction is particularly important. An exercise following a play can ask for a description of a character’s decision. It need not require an account of distressing personal experience. Literary precision comes from returning to the scene, not measuring disclosure. If a personal association arises, its owner decides whether to discuss it. Others can accept that boundary without interpreting silence. This arrangement promises no removal of every difficulty. It simply makes participation voluntary and leaves the work its own task, instead of using it as an occasion to take authority over another person’s biography.

VII. Represented pain and a claim on attention

A distressing representation does not become significant simply through being distressing. A reader can ask what makes a person, circumstance or action visible, and what merely holds the gaze. The question requires no advance condemnation of an expressive scene or prohibition of a technique. It asks for a ground of attention. Can the represented person speak? Does that person retain relationships and choices, or function only as a means of affecting others? Artistic decisions vary, but their differences can be discussed. The intensity of an impression does not itself explain why this particular detail belongs in this particular work, or what work the detail performs there.

Imagine two fictional accounts of a similar misfortune. In one, a person exists only to make a central character remorseful. In the other, that person has intentions, relationships and words before the event. Without reading the works, we cannot declare the second better in every respect. We can identify a difference: one participant has more space of their own within the narrative. This makes visible the cost of an ending that reduces every important question to the main character’s relief. A tragic work may keep someone present whose fate cannot be disposed of for another person’s closure. That possibility belongs to a particular text, not every unhappy ending.

An encounter with another person’s story can therefore leave a question about responsibility in looking. What did the work help me notice, and what did I make convenient for my conclusion? An answer grants no authority to speak for an actual person with apparently similar experience. Similar circumstances do not make that person’s feelings known. Even a sincere response remains a response to the work. This boundary lets us value art while taking care over transfer. A question formed through reading may matter elsewhere, but another conversation requires other knowledge, the participant’s consent and attention to that person’s words, instead of an allocation of ready literary roles.

VIII. An ending in form and an unfinished response

The last scene finishes a work without necessarily finishing the reader’s relation to it. We can know what happened and continue examining what it means for a chosen question. This incompleteness need not be treated immediately as a defect; it can belong to the activity of reading. Yet calling every difficulty evidence of depth would be equally hasty. A scene may be inconsistent, a discussion unclear, or an interest exhausted. Distinguishing these possibilities calls for naming the remaining question. Asking why an act is presented as inevitable invites a return to the text. Deciding that we ought to remain distressed imposes an obligation without identifying its ground.

In Aristotle’s definition in Poetics VI, Butcher translates a relation between pity, fear and purgation. That wording belongs to a theoretical text; it establishes no modern therapeutic result. Our concern is the boundary between an account of artistic action and a promise addressed to a reader. Someone may find clarity, tiredness, disagreement or no noticeable change. None need be declared the uniquely correct response in advance. Discussion can ask what became distinguishable in the work and what remains unclear. Scenes can support that description, whereas a guaranteed change in a person’s condition would require a different kind of evidence.

Wanting to return to ordinary life after reading need not reject seriousness. One can prepare food, speak about something else or leave a note for tomorrow. A work does not lose significance because an encounter has a boundary. Limited time can help distinguish attention from a continuous performance of depth. One question may be kept without prolonging every impression. Sometimes we return to it; sometimes other matters take its place. Both possibilities belong to the reader. A literary conversation can clarify what was noticed without establishing a way of life in which a difficult work receives permanent priority over rest, enjoyment and ordinary relationships.

IX. Reading together without one compulsory conclusion

A shared discussion can distinguish three claims: what is shown, how I interpret it, and why it concerns me. The first requires textual support. The second invites examination of an interpretation. The third belongs to the participant and need not become a general rule. Without this distinction, personal significance turns into a demand for identical response: because a scene matters to me, everyone should see it in the same way. The common ground can be a subject of attention rather than an entire attitude towards it. Readers can compare reasons, recover an overlooked line and keep different impressions without agreeing on why tragedy should matter to everyone.

A useful objection concerns a particular ground. Another reader may notice that we called a choice unavailable although an earlier scene showed its possibility. Part of the conclusion can then change. This need not invalidate every impression or reveal an inadequate depth of feeling. We can acknowledge a mistake about available action while keeping the question of loss important. Such qualification makes discussion more precise without turning it into competition. A tragic work may matter because several valid observations remain together without becoming a convenient general moral. Their differences deserve description rather than compulsory removal for the sake of a satisfying last sentence.

A reader can also fail to find an answer to a personal question in the selected work. This does not disprove its value for somebody else. The question may belong to another episode, genre or conversation. Discussion can end honestly by identifying that mismatch. We understood the

scene’s arrangement but found no ground for the answer we sought; perhaps our initial question was too broad. This modest result allows a more deliberate next choice. Every encounter with tragedy need not be declared useful afterwards. Its significance can remain particular: for whom, in which task, and on the basis of what content that was actually examined.

X. Possible value without compulsory benefit

The question of why we make room for tragedy therefore needs no single answer for everyone. In a particular encounter it may preserve something an explanation closes too quickly: a discrepancy between worth and success, acknowledgment of loss, or speech without ready reassurance. These possibilities make neither suffering necessary nor other genres dispensable. Comedy, a fortunate resolution or a quiet essay can also pose a serious question. Value concerns what became visible and could be supported, rather than the recognised difficulty of the content. A reader can choose another approach to the same question, or a different question that matters more at the present time.

A particular seriousness in discussing tragedy may consist in promising no more than the encounter provides. Examining actions and distinctions grants no power to predict an entire life. Hearing a character’s words supplies no knowledge of every actual person’s feelings. Recognising the irreversibility of one event does not require declaring all future possibilities closed. This measure does not impoverish a work. It leaves the work its expressiveness and the reader a decision about continuing. Rather than ready reassurance or compulsory severity, there is a possibility of precise attention: close enough to notice what matters, and limited enough to avoid taking possession of somebody else’s life.

After the last page, one examinable question can remain instead of a general lesson. Where did I confuse a consequence with a moral verdict? Which speech did I try to close too quickly? What did I call repaired merely because another participant acknowledged a mistake? Answers concern this reading and need no immediate transfer to personal relationships. A later, apparently similar situation would need fresh consideration of its information and participants. Tragedy’s possible value can remain open and honest: a work helps articulate a distinction without deciding for a person. It can accompany attention while leaving the next book, another conversation and the ordinary pleasures of a day available.

What this means in practice

Choose a brief episode from a familiar work that is comfortable to examine now. There is no need to select its most distressing scene or revisit a personal misfortune. Briefly record what happens, distinguishing the represented action from your interpretation. Identify one circumstance known to the reader and ask whether the character knew it before deciding. If that is unclear, record the uncertainty. Then choose one question: about available action, consequences or speech that remains unanswered. Keep the question narrow enough for the episode to supply a possible ground.

Examine what actually changes by the episode’s ending. What is repaired, what is acknowledged, and what is not restored? Every category need not be filled. The work may supply insufficient information, which also belongs in the record. Separately state an evaluation of a particular action and an attitude towards a particular misfortune. Check whether one has cancelled the other without a ground. Sympathy need not become acquittal, while criticism need not declare every pain deserved. Identify one utterance or event supporting the conclusion. A full retelling of the work is unnecessary; the task is to make the specific ground accessible.

If discussing the record with someone else, invite examination of that ground. Require neither an identical impression nor personal disclosure. Finish by identifying a boundary of the answer: what belongs to the selected scene, what cannot be known from the text, and what remains open. You can stop there, pause or choose another genre. This exercise concerns literary attention. It diagnoses no condition, replaces no assistance in an actual difficult situation, and promises no relief through reading. Its completed result is a modest record of an episode actually considered, rather than a compulsory lesson about life.

Key quotation

> *neither had I rest, neither was I quiet*

— Job 3:26, King James Version, selected middle clauses. Words from a particular lament, not a prescription for the reader’s attitude or a general explanation of suffering.

Connections between traditions

1. **Are action and outcome one ground of judgment?** Poetics VI gives action a central place; King Lear 5.3 places a late rescue order beside loss that is not restored. The comparison lets us examine what is undertaken separately from what is achieved. A worthy further act does not automatically close the history of consequences. An ancient prescription and a particular English ending establish neither a general theory of guilt nor the futility of action.

2. **What remains when reassurance does not close speech?** Job 3:26 retains an absence of quiet; Edgar’s ending in King Lear 5.3.392–395 remains beside the weight of events. The relation concerns an unfinished reassuring answer, not identical beliefs. It lets a reader keep a question open. Biblical lament belongs to a religious text and Edgar’s speech to a dramatic world; neither specifies a compulsory modern response.

3. **An intense representation and the participant’s own speech.** Poetics XIV distinguishes construction from spectacle; Job 3:24–26 gives room to a sufferer’s speech. These are different ways of directing attention beyond an image’s effect. Our editorial question is whether a person whose loss is represented can also be heard. This does not claim that Job follows Aristotle’s genre theory or prescribe a single artistic form.

4. **A work’s ending and a reader’s condition.** In Poetics VI Aristotle connects tragedy with serious, complete action and with pity and fear; Butcher renders the subsequent effect as purgation of these emotions. In King Lear 5.3 Edmund’s late rescue order does not restore Cordelia, Lear dies, and Edgar ends by acknowledging the weight of the time. The shared question is how a completed structure relates to what remains to be experienced. The comparison distinguishes completion of the represented action from removal of loss within its world; for our topic, this gives a reason not to promise readers relief simply because the text has ended. An ancient genre definition and a particular English ending serve different purposes: a translated concept of purgation does not measure a modern response, while Edgar’s speech prescribes neither an obligatory feeling nor a medical outcome for readers.

5. **The presence of difficult words.** Questions accompany lament in Job 3:20–26; Edgar’s concluding speech in King Lear returns to the weight of the present time. Their difference lets us ask how to listen without assigning a ready moral to a speaker. The relation concerns attention to an utterance’s position rather than a common doctrine. Discussion can retain the words’ contexts while leaving another actual person’s feelings unknown and requiring no personal confession.

Primary sources

1. Aristotle, Poetics, S. H. Butcher translation: VI, XIII, XIV. The selected reading concerns definition and action, genre preferences, and construction versus spectacle. These passages and translator credits were read; no reading of the complete treatise or Greek original is claimed. Ancient poetics establishes no modern psychological effect.

2. William Shakespeare, King Lear 5.3, original English Folger text: final passage, through-lines 3535–3645. The entire selected passage was read, without claiming a reading or retelling of the whole play. The epigraph is a brief fragment of Edgar’s line 3642; the Russian version is United Wisdom’s own translation.

3. The Book of Job, chapter 3, King James Version. All 26 verses were read; the article focuses on speech and questioning, particularly 3:20–26. The key quotation comes from 3:26 and is rendered into Russian by United Wisdom from KJV. No reading of the complete book or Hebrew original is claimed. Religious lament retains its horizon and is not classified here as stage tragedy.

Tags

tragedy, literature, drama, reading, art, choice, action, consequence, loss, irreversibility, sympathy, responsibility, speech, lament, question, attention, spectator, form, ending, construction, Aristotle, Poetics, Shakespeare, King Lear, Job, religious text, interpretation, discussion, boundaries, freedom

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.