

UNITED WISDOM

Seriousness Without a Final Verdict on Yourself

Meaning and Direction

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

P-21-N05 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Seriousness Without a Final Verdict on Yourself

Epigraph

> *it is always learning and making trial*

— Michel de Montaigne, “Of Repentance,” chapter II of the selected carrier volume 14, Charles Cotton translation. A fragment at the end of the paragraph “Could my soul once take footing”; “it” refers to the author’s soul.

What this article is about

Taking a task seriously does not necessarily require a final definition of the person doing it. Someone can answer for a promise, examine a claim, and acknowledge consequences while leaving their description of themselves open to revision. This article explores that distinction through the opening of Montaigne's “Of Repentance,” Socrates' account of examining wisdom in Plato's Apology, and selected verses of Ecclesiastes 7. A changing self-portrait, a philosophical defence, and a religious reflection on imperfection retain different grounds. The contemporary scenes are invented examples, not behavioural research. The question is specific: when are we protecting a necessary commitment, and when are we trying to make our present image the final answer to every future question? Leaving that answer open does not remove responsibility or promise relief, better relationships, or a psychological outcome.

I. A Serious Task and a Final Image

Imagine someone arranging a small gathering who promised to send the address in time. They discover that the message contains the wrong house number. Taking the task seriously calls for correcting the information and telling the recipients. There is no need first to decide whether the sender is, overall, an attentive or inattentive person. The mistake belongs to a particular message. Its consequences may be inconvenient, but they do not automatically define an entire person. When the conversation moves immediately to a final image, the necessary action can be overlooked. In our scene, the address remains wrong while its author explains why they never let people down, or why nobody should trust them about anything.

These opposite explanations work in a similar way: one event acquires too large a scope. A claim of perfection protects an image against a fact; a claim of complete inadequacy makes the fact universal. Both can obscure a simpler question: what is known now, who was affected, and what correction is possible? This is not a psychological law, nor a promise that asking a

precise question will immediately change a feeling. It distinguishes the subjects under discussion. Admitting a mistake may be difficult, and that difficulty deserves its own description. It does not establish that every later event must confirm today's conclusion, reached during a few minutes of irritation, embarrassment, or defence of a familiar reputation.

Not making yourself a final figure means preserving the limits of a claim. I have made an error in this address; this message needs correction; these participants' trust may require further attention. There is sufficient seriousness in those sentences, although none supplies a complete portrait. The sender need not disclose their feelings to everyone or immediately replace a negative description with a positive one. They can leave the general image uncertain and carry out the known part of the task. That does not reduce the importance of other people's time. It allows that time to be discussed directly, without making participants witnesses in a grand trial of the sender's ultimate worth.

II. Montaigne Describes Movement Rather Than Issuing a Certificate

At the beginning of “Of Repentance,” Montaigne distinguishes forming a person from describing one particular person. In Charles Cotton's English translation, his changing subject is considered at a particular moment. The self-portrait allows for time and possible contradiction between observations. What matters here is the structure of the description: today's sentence has circumstances, and another observation may require another sentence. This is a historical literary position, not a scientific theory of personality. It does not establish that people have no lasting characteristics, that every promise expires tomorrow, or that any contradiction deserves approval merely because someone describing themselves has called life changeable. These would be additional claims requiring grounds of their own.

Montaigne does not present himself simply as someone who is never certain. In the same selected opening, he strongly asserts knowledge of his subject and fidelity to his work. Those sentences prevent the essay from becoming a convenient slogan of perpetual modesty. An author can acknowledge movement while placing considerable confidence in his account. Readers need to see both features, even if one is closer to their present question. We take the possibility of revising a self-portrait, not a certificate of the author's infallibility. His confidence remains part of the historical statement. It does not prove that a contemporary self-explanation is accurate whenever it is delivered freely, expressively, or without visible solemnity.

Ordinary life in Montaigne also needs no exceptional brilliance to become a subject of moral reflection. This lets us consider the address scene without turning it into an extraordinary lesson. A small action can be described without assigning its author the role of a great example for final imitation or final condemnation. Yet its ordinariness does not make the action

insignificant to someone who went to the wrong place. The scale of a story and the scale of its consequences require separate attention. Revising the description concerns the sender's image; lost time concerns particular participants. Their testimony remains relevant even if the sender prefers to regard themselves as a changing, unfinished subject of inquiry.

III. Socrates Distinguishes Knowledge from a Claim to Know

In the selected sequence of the Apology, Socrates explains why he examined people regarded as wise. Plato's account, in Benjamin Jowett's translation, connects that activity with the Delphic oracle's answer. The speech is not an independently established transcript, and its religious ground cannot quietly disappear for the sake of a modern formula. Socrates distinguishes someone who does not know but thinks they know from his own position in a particular comparison. This is not a simple declaration that everyone lacks all knowledge. In the same sequence, he acknowledges skills of craftsmen that he does not possess. The problem is the move from an actual skill to an insufficiently grounded claim about other important matters.

Imagine an experienced organiser who is good at making schedules. Their skill is real within our invented scene, and colleagues can reasonably consult them about it. The ability to allocate hours, however, does not establish knowledge of every participant's motives or the right arrangement of their private lives. A boundary does not take away competence; it identifies its subject. This contemporary application belongs to our argument, rather than being a ready-made Socratic instruction for staff meetings. The question is: which part of my statement rests on experience, and which gained authority only from my role? An answer can preserve confidence where there are grounds and leave unknown what the available information does not establish.

Seriousness therefore need not mean answering everything. A person can specify what they can do and refer another question to someone with relevant knowledge. This does not promise a calm feeling: acknowledging a boundary may be awkward. Neither self-abasement before another person's competence nor a new superiority based on professed ignorance is required. Plato's narrative includes conflict, hostility, and a particular mission; our example does not turn these into compulsory standards for relationships. It uses the narrower distinction between the grounds of a statement and the breadth of its claim. The conversation may end without a public examination of another person's depth or the speaker's own spiritual maturity.

IV. Imperfection Does Not Cancel Particular Harm

In Ecclesiastes 7:20–22, the absence of a perfectly righteous person appears beside a warning concerning all the words one hears and a reminder of one's own words against others. We read these verses in the King James Version, within a religious chapter about wisdom, rather than as psychological guidance. They include the historical relationship of master and servant, which cannot become a present-day rule of submission. A bounded question is possible here: before making something heard a final judgement about yourself or another person, what place does your own imperfection have? That comparison does not make all offences equivalent or render an affected person's complaint unnecessary, mistaken, or morally insufficient.

Saying that people make mistakes is not enough to examine an individual event. One person had power to decide; another depended on the decision being carried out. One said something harsh; another broke a substantial agreement. A general sentence does not erase these distinctions. In our imagined gathering, the organiser can remember other errors of their own, while participants still have the right to report time lost because of the wrong address. The organiser gains no ground for answering that those participants surely once let somebody down too. Remembering one's imperfection concerns a claim to flawlessness, rather than somebody else's right to describe consequences. Human similarity and responsibility in a situation can coexist without substituting for each other.

The warning about every word heard likewise does not become an order to endure threats, conceal a violation, or decline support. Our subject is the limit of a general portrait, rather than a universal safety procedure. Someone can refrain from treating every remark as the last answer about themselves and still take a particular report of harm seriously. Incomplete information can remain incomplete. A necessary pause in a conversation can be stated without an obligation to forgive. The distinction does not require calling a difficult situation a beneficial experience. It resists an overquick passage from individual words to an exhaustive figure of a person, while actual actions and conditions continue to require their own examination.

V. A Changed Description and an Earlier Promise

Montaigne's attention to change does not automatically settle obligations. A person may now understand their role differently, while an earlier promise still affects others. In the selected opening, the author speaks about fidelity as well as movement; later in the same read sequence he names particular matters of conscience, including his word and payment for work. We do not accept that self-testimony as independently verified biography. What matters is that a moving self-portrait exists beside questions of conduct. A contemporary sentence such as “I am different now” therefore needs clarification: what changed in the description, and what happened to the agreement on which someone else was already relying?

In an invented scene, a project participant previously described themselves as always ready to help. They later realise they cannot keep accepting requests indefinitely. Revising the general image is permissible: permanent availability was an inaccurate description. An already accepted particular task, however, requires a separate conversation. Perhaps it can be completed, transferred by agreement, or rescheduled with those affected by its outcome. None of these possibilities follows from the single sentence about personal change. We prescribe no identical answer for everyone. The distinction is between withdrawing an overlarge self-definition and dealing with an actual commitment that already has participants, a history, and consequences. Those features deserve their own attention rather than being absorbed into a new portrait.

The distinction also protects a boundary. Without a particular promise, another person's expectation does not become an obligation solely because of an earlier flattering image. “You always help” may describe the speaker's experience, but it does not determine every future action. Someone can clarify their current availability without defending their entire personality. Yet whether an agreement arose cannot be settled in advance either way. We need to learn what was said and what was actually accepted. Keeping a self-description open matters here as a possibility for precise conversation. It is neither permission to forget participants nor a duty to resemble forever the final figure of a helper that happens to suit them.

VI. Words About Yourself Have a Date and a Position

Imagine someone looking unusually confident in an old photograph. They may remember speaking differently then, choosing different activities, and questioning certain answers less. The photograph does not itself establish all this: some of the account belongs to memory and present interpretation. Date, event, and what is actually known can be clarified while other circumstances remain open. Our example does not say that earlier confidence was pretence or that current doubt must be deeper. Two descriptions concern different positions. They can differ without one being appointed the authentic face and the other an error to be removed from history so that the person can finally acquire a single correct portrait.

The opening of “Of Repentance” offers literary attention to the moment of description. Its author considers changing circumstances and intentions, rather than only successive ages. The contemporary use remains narrower: a sentence about oneself can be accompanied by a question about when and in connection with what it arose. This is no requirement to keep a permanent diary or a promise that recording a date makes self-description accurate. Sometimes a date is insufficient and testimony conflicts. The contradiction can remain a question. Respecting today's thought does not require appointing it final editor of an entire earlier life, with power to declare nonexistent whatever now seems inconvenient, unfamiliar, or inconsistent with the desired image.

This caution also extends to other people's accounts. A friend remembers one episode, a colleague another; each may see something important without possessing the whole. Conflicting memories call for attention to the subject, rather than an immediate verdict about who finally understood another person's true essence. Our argument only needs to distinguish observation, conclusion, and the limit of knowledge. Someone can dispute a particular statement about themselves without submitting an exhaustive portrait in response. They can also decline to discuss their personal history. An open description does not grant universal access to a biography. The possibility of revision belongs with the person's right to choose what to disclose and how to participate in the present conversation.

VII. Expressiveness Does Not Establish Grounds

Seriousness is sometimes recognised through appearance: measured speech, a confident posture, no smile. These signs, however, do not provide sufficient information about the subject. In our invented scene, two people explain the corrected address. One sounds solemn, the other brief and unremarkable. To a participant, it matters more whether the number was actually corrected and the message arrived. Form can matter to communication, but it does not replace examining content. We claim neither that restraint always improves on solemnity nor that every serious speech deserves suspicion. The question is which matter a form of expression actually answers and which remains open despite an impression of reliability, ease, or respect arising in its listener.

In Plato's defence, Socrates discusses the truth of his words and explains the origin of his reputation. The selected account contains confident assertions as well as acknowledgements of ignorance. It cannot therefore serve as a correct tone of voice that readers simply need to copy. The contemporary phrase “I may be mistaken” likewise does not prove everything that follows it. It can honestly identify a limit; information about the particular matter is still needed. Equally, “I know” can be grounded when the speaker specifies a subject and a basis. Distinguishing these cases matters, but this article neither determines someone's moral character from a few phrases nor provides an infallible test of authentic modesty.

A final image appears when form gains too much authority: because I look responsible, checking is unnecessary; because I speak lightly, the matter is unimportant. Both moves require grounds that an expression alone has not supplied. A familiar manner of speech can be retained while particular questions are answered. No special style is needed to give the correct address or clarify the boundary of competence. Someone may be sparing, serious, or smiling if that does not replace attention to participants. Freedom of form is not freedom from content. In our scene, every expression remains beside the same task: provide accurate information and establish that the necessary correction actually became available to the people concerned.

VIII. Correction Does Not Require Self-Abasement

Acknowledging an inaccuracy sometimes comes with a large account of one's shortcomings. A participant, however, may primarily need corrected information rather than a public verdict against its author. In our scene, the sender says that the number was wrong and the correct one has now been sent. This does not settle every consequence, but it names a fact and an action. Self-abasement is no compulsory proof of sincerity. Others can still have questions or reject the offered explanation. We do not promise that a brief acknowledgement immediately restores trust, removes awkwardness, or eliminates further conversation. Its adequacy depends on the particular matter and circumstances, rather than on a universal formula about how much confession is enough.

Humour may arise in this situation, but it is not necessary to finish it. Someone can notice the absurdity of their own solemn image and smile, or prefer a precise serious sentence. This article does not prescribe laughing at oneself or treat the absence of laughter as evidence of closedness. A boundary matters: a joke must not give others a duty to regard consequences as trivial. If participants were late because of the wrong address, an amusing description of the organiser does not return their time. They can smile, object, or leave the joke unsupported. Not making oneself a final figure concerns one's own image, rather than a right to remove somebody else's loss from discussion.

The same applies to abandoning earlier praise. A person can stop repeating “I never make mistakes” without replacing it with “I am incapable of anything.” Between the two extreme formulas, particular sentences remain possible: I have substantial skill here; information was missing there; this result needs correction. These statements do not guarantee a correct decision, but they permit each part to be discussed separately. No general agreement with the revised portrait is required. Another person can judge from their own observations and retain their conclusions. Continuing a task may sometimes require only a mutually clarified action, while the general description stays disputed, unnecessary, or not yet ready to be put into words at this moment.

IX. Openness Does Not Mean Agreement with Everything

An unfinished description can be mistaken for a duty to doubt endlessly and yield to every objection. Recognising a limit of knowledge, however, does not make every statement equally grounded. In our scene, two messages give different house numbers, and the organiser checks the address against an actual available basis. They can then state the result confidently while leaving room for correction if new information appears. Seriousness needs neither an entirely infallible personality nor abandonment of a conclusion. It is enough to show what has been checked now and where the answer rests. A dispute about the whole person is not a necessary component of every practical clarification that participants need to finish today.

Socrates acknowledges craftsmen's knowledge and separately challenges their enlarged claims. The pair helps preserve a boundary between actual skill and an overlarge conclusion. Montaigne, in turn, combines trying with confidence in his chosen subject. Their grounds differ: a philosophical defence before a court and a historical self-portrait do not supply one ready procedure for a contemporary discussion. We compare the structure of statements without transferring the authors' status to ourselves. Someone does not become a new Socrates because another person disliked their question. Hostility does not prove correctness. When an answer is disputed, the argument and circumstances need consideration; an uncomfortable encounter is not evidence that one's wisdom has finally been established.

A general image can remain open while a particular boundary is firmly stated. Someone may say they are not accepting another task now, not discussing their private history, or not agreeing with a specified claim. That does not require presenting every future reason for refusal. Particular responsibility, meanwhile, does not disappear because an overall portrait is unavailable. An accepted commitment needs examination; a claim of knowledge permits a question about its grounds. Both subjects can be retained without a final conclusion about participants' maturity, character, or spiritual position. Our argument leaves room for firm action and revisable speech, without making either of them proof that the other must necessarily be mistaken or illegitimate.

X. A Person Can Remain Larger Than Today's Formula

After a conversation, someone may want to fix the description they have found: now I know exactly what sort of person I am. The thought may matter without governing every future case. It can remain a current conclusion about several observations, with its grounds named and revision possible. This article requires neither continually breaking down self-confidence nor abandoning important convictions. The issue is scope: one formula rarely includes every future circumstance, known and unknown relationship, new action, and other person's testimony. Serious attention to today's decision can exist without a claim to make it the last word about someone who will continue living, acting, and answering for what they do.

The three sources show different limits of such a claim. Montaigne describes a changing subject alongside confidence and demands of fidelity. Socrates, in Plato's account, distinguishes particular knowledge from enlarged pretension under the sign of the oracle. Ecclesiastes speaks of imperfection and one's own speech within a religious horizon. These are not three confirmations of a scientific theory. A reader may accept one ground, question another, or leave a religious question open. Our common subject is narrower: avoiding replacement of attention to an action with defence of an exhaustive image. This does not require making every tradition identical or certifying its conclusions because the comparison felt expressive or close to personal experience.

At the end of our invented story, the address is corrected but the organiser's general portrait is still unfinished. One participant is satisfied with the message; another remembers being late; the sender wants to check subsequent invitations more carefully. These positions can coexist. Neither unanimous acquittal nor becoming forever the figure of one mistake is required. Someone can return to consequences, continue a conversation, or leave the general conclusion unnamed. Seriousness remains in their relation to the task and other people. Not completing oneself means only that today's description retains limits: it does not cancel what happened, prescribe a feeling, or deny future observations the right to add what the present words do not contain.

What this means in practice

If this reflection is suitable now, you might choose one description of yourself that you have already used and ask which circumstances it concerns. Separate observation from general conclusion: what happened, what is known, and what remains an assumption? There is no need to choose the hardest episode, keep a permanent diary, or disclose a private history. Something unknown can remain unknown.

If there is a particular promise or inaccurate message, consider it separately from the portrait. What was accepted, who relies on the action, and what clarification is available now? A limited

description does not cancel consequences. Without a promise, another person's convenient image does not automatically create one; the relevant circumstances need to be learned rather than assigned in advance.

You can finish with a short statement of the present position without a final verdict on yourself. No smile, forgiveness, relief, or unanimous approval is required. This example is not treatment or a test of spiritual maturity. You can leave the question open, proceed to a known action, or postpone discussion while retaining the right to seriousness and further clarification of your words.

Key quotation

> *I neither know nor think that I know*

— Plato, Apology, paragraph “So I left him,” Benjamin Jowett translation. Selected fragment of Socrates’ particular comparison with an interlocutor, not a claim that everyone lacks all knowledge.

Connections between traditions

1. **A moving portrait and a limit of knowledge.** The opening of “Of Repentance” situates description in a moment; the Apology’s examination of wisdom distinguishes skill from enlarged pretension. The relation concerns a statement’s scope: a self-description and an answer on a particular subject can have boundaries. Seriousness can retain an answer without a complete definition of personality. A historical self-portrait and a defence with religious grounds form no scientific theory of change or compulsory doubt.

2. **Imperfection and the right to describe consequences.** Ecclesiastes 7:20–22 recalls one’s own speech and imperfection; the read opening of “Of Repentance” retains fidelity and particular conduct. The comparison separates an imperfect image from a promise or harm. In our scene, correcting an address requires no verdict on a whole person. A religious verse and an author’s self-testimony neither make every violation equivalent nor deprive another person of the right to complain about consequences.

3. **Skill and final authority.** The selected Apology account acknowledges craftsmen’s knowledge while challenging its extension to other high matters; Ecclesiastes 7:23–24, read in the adjacent context, describes difficulty in attaining wisdom. The shared question concerns how far a present basis supports an answer. It prevents good competence from becoming an exhaustive portrait of someone who knows. Plato’s oracle and biblical wisdom retain different religious grounds; comparison requires no denial of verified particular knowledge.

4. **Confidence and possible revision.** In the selected opening, Montaigne joins trying with strong confidence in his subject; Socrates confidently explains his questioning through the oracle while distinguishing fields of knowledge. The relation resists a simple opposition between seriousness and openness. Present grounds can be named without making them an answer about the whole self. This proves neither author's self-assessment and does not make a hostile reaction evidence of one's correctness.

5. **Words about a person and one's own speech.** A changing self-portrait in "Of Repentance" and recollection of one's words in Ecclesiastes 7:21–22 direct attention to the speaker's position. The possible relation is not treating an overheard description as exhaustive while remembering one's own participation. It leaves room for precise conversation. The historical master–servant relationship becomes no contemporary norm; the comparison requires neither silence about harm, forgiveness, nor disclosure of a private history.

6. **An ordinary task without a great exemplary role.** The selected Montaigne opening gives significance to particular and ordinary life; the Apology's account of craftsmen acknowledges specific skills. The comparison lets attention remain on a small action and actual knowledge without requiring a final figure of perfection. A corrected address can matter in itself. These sources establish no identical genres, beliefs, or public roles and do not cancel responsibility for a particular commitment or consequence.

Primary sources

1. Michel de Montaigne, "Of Repentance", chapter II of the selected carrier volume 14, Charles Cotton's English translation edited by William Carew Hazlitt; the carrier identifies 1877. The continuous opening was read from the description of one particular person through the listed matters of conscience, including one's word and payment for work. Title and translation credits were checked. The epigraph is a selected fragment concerning the author's soul. No reading of the complete essay, all Essays, or French original is claimed. Literary self-testimony is neither a scientific personality theory nor independently verified biography.

2. Plato, Apology, Benjamin Jowett translation. The continuous selected sequence concerning the oracle and examinations of people, including acknowledgement of craftsmen's knowledge, was read alongside adjacent speech context and translator credits. The key quotation is a selected fragment from "So I left him." No reading of the complete work or Greek original is claimed. This is a literary philosophical defence with religious grounds, not an independently confirmed trial transcript or empirical study.

3. Ecclesiastes, chapter 7, King James Version. All 29 verses and version information were read. The focus is 7:20–22, with 7:23–24 retained as adjacent context concerning wisdom's limits. No reading of the complete book or Hebrew original is claimed. Religious grounds and

historical relations become no present rule of submission, silence about harm, or obligatory forgiveness. Not every statement in the read chapter is adopted into the contemporary argument.

Tags

seriousness, self-description, responsibility, promise, knowledge, ignorance, confidence, change, imperfection, speech, action, boundaries, image, portrait, time, circumstances, competence, testimony, correction, attention, philosophy, literature, wisdom, Montaigne, Plato, Socrates, Ecclesiastes, interpretation, freedom, conversation

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.