

UNITED WISDOM

A ritual that has lost its meaning

Meaning and Direction

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

P-22-N01 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

A ritual that has lost its meaning

Epigraph

> *have removed their heart far from me*

— Isaiah29:13, short excerpt, King James Version. This is prophetic religious criticism, not a verdict on anyone's contemporary family custom.

What this article is about

A weekly call once felt like an encounter to look forward to. Now it begins with the same greeting, moves through compulsory questions, and ends with relief that the routine was observed. A holiday table once brought people together; now the priority is preparing everything exactly as before. The form remains, but someone can no longer say clearly what it serves. Such a discrepancy does not always require abandoning a custom immediately. A feeling may have faded while significance remains; another form may be needed; or continuation may indeed have become an unwanted duty. This article examines ritual that has lost meaning without judging traditions as a whole. It draws on distinct primary texts about form, remembrance, return, and the purpose of a means. We then distinguish tiredness from withdrawn agreement, personal significance from shared significance, and revision from broken connection. The invitation is to understand what remains worth keeping, at what cost, and with what freedom.

I. What exactly is no longer present

First distinguish significance from feeling. Someone may no longer experience the old joy at a commemorative gathering yet still consider it important. Tiredness, a different kind of day, or another state can make participation quiet. We cannot establish the causes of emotional change from one scene. A lack of intensity does not itself mean a lack of significance. If someone can name what they preserve and why they choose to join, the form need not be empty. A requirement to recover the original feeling can itself turn the gathering into an examination that obscures what remains.

A different situation arises when nothing can be named except the demand to continue. Someone knows the sequence and can perform it flawlessly but no longer recognizes its connection with a concern. Even then, an immediate final conclusion is unnecessary. Significance may have become unclear and could be clarified by a story about its history. It may belong to other participants while one's own agreement remains unresolved. Or the original purpose may have disappeared with its circumstances. These possibilities call for

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

different decisions. What exactly was lost is more precise than declaring every rite empty or every change destructive.

Imagine a reunion of former classmates. Every year they repeat one route, although some can no longer walk that far, while conversation repeatedly returns to memories others find unpleasant. One participant wants to keep the meeting, another to change the route, and a third simply to be allowed not to attend. They may be describing different losses: accessibility, reciprocity, interest, or freedom. Calling every answer insufficient loyalty to a shared past would end the conversation before it begins. This invented scene is not group research; it shows why specifying a loss helps avoid arguing about an imagined single cause.

Describe the most recent occasion in ordinary language. What was done, what was expected, what became difficult or empty, and what was still valuable? You need not immediately explain what kind of person you have become or what this means for your entire life. An account can contain tension: I am glad to see these people and no longer want this particular arrangement. That leaves a possibility of preserving connection while changing form. It promises no agreement from others, but it gives discussion a subject instead of demanding a choice between complete obedience and complete separation.

II. A form's history does not replace present agreement

A custom may have an important history. It began during hardship, connected a dispersed family, or kept the memory of someone who died. Learning that history can be more meaningful than immediately judging the action by present convenience. Origin and agreement are different questions, however. History explains why a form arose; it cannot answer for every participant today. Someone may want to continue, keep only part, or hear the story without joining the ceremony. This does not diminish the past. It prevents past significance from being used as consent already obtained from a person in the present.

In an imagined family, a holiday recipe keeps a grandmother's memory. A grandson can no longer spend a whole day cooking but wants to meet and talk about her. If the recipe is treated as the only proof of love, every change becomes threatening. Naming remembrance and togetherness first makes other options visible: cook less, share the work, choose another day, or keep the story. None need suit everyone. The conversation can still identify what participants protect: the dish itself, their role, connection with a person, or fear that changing it will remove their last shared activity.

Sometimes a story restores significance. Someone learns why a family leaves an empty chair or makes a certain pause and wants to continue. Sometimes the same story confirms that the form does not suit them, although respect for the people remains. Both responses are possible. If only the first is allowed, explanation becomes persuasion rather than transmission

of history. A story can be offered, a response heard, and no immediate decision demanded. What matters is a human conversation, not a successful formula supposed to make everyone recover the same experience.

A religious form adds another level: its established significance within a tradition. Personal feeling alone cannot replace that meaning if someone wants to understand the tradition itself. A knowledgeable interlocutor can clarify what is prescribed, what is a local custom, and which modes of participation exist. Explaining religious meaning does not eliminate the need to consider one's own relation and actual capacities. This article authorizes no changes to rites and demands no membership. It distinguishes knowledge about a form, personal choice, and negotiation where several people participate from different grounds.

III. Why Confucius defends a ceremony

In Analects3.17, Zigong wants to end a sheep offering associated with the beginning of the month, and Confucius replies that he values the ceremony. This passage complicates an easy modern answer: it does not say every surviving form should immediately yield to convenience. The same book, in3.3–3.4, discusses humanity, restraint, and genuine grief. We can therefore notice tension between preserving form and its inward quality. It cannot be resolved by claiming that Confucius always defends outward order or always favors personal feeling. Analects3.3–3.17.

A preserved form may carry significance not fully available to one participant now. A calendar, language, arrangement, or shared song can be transmitted through periods when an individual feels little interest. That possibility deserves consideration without proving the value of every act of preservation. Ask whom a form connects and which story passes through it. The answer may broaden an initial judgment. It should still name a particular significance and cost, instead of declaring every established action untouchable merely because it has existed for a long time.

Preservation usually has a particular keeper: someone cooks, organizes, reminds, and bears the cost. If others call a tradition shared while leaving all the work to this person, significance also concerns the distribution of participation. A ceremony can be valued while asking who sustains it. In a contemporary family, that question should not be presented as a direct rule from Confucius; it is our editorial question for an imagined situation. It distinguishes keeping something important from routinely using another person's effort as though it had no limits and required no agreement.

Careful reading keeps the passage's difficulty intact. It lets us acknowledge transmission without using historical authority to answer on behalf of a present participant. Someone may retain a form while studying its meaning, make it more accessible, or acknowledge that

personal choice differs from a traditional requirement. These are not identical decisions, and the article does not conceal that difference. A reference should help name the actual conflict instead of ending discussion with words that leave a person only the options of agreement or being judged unworthy.

IV. Outward honor and a distant heart

Isaiah29.13 distinguishes honor with the lips from a heart moved away; neighboring verses situate that criticism within a relation to God and a prophetic warning. We do not make it a universal psychology of ritual or use it to judge another person's faith. For this subject, the relevant observation is religious criticism of outward conformity from within the text. A tradition can contain questions about its own forms rather than only demands to repeat them. This limited textual observation does not establish that every loss of personal interest is the distance described by the source. Isaiah29:13–16.

A personal situation may look different. Someone says compulsory words at an anniversary without understanding what they affirm. They might clarify the words before trying to sound more convincing. Different words may suit them; silence may matter more; or they may keep the formula as participation in a shared language without pretending to a feeling. There is no single correct expression here. There is room to distinguish what someone actually affirms, what they want to express, and what others expect to hear.

Insincerity should not be inferred from someone's quietness, awkwardness, or lack of expressiveness. A person may feel deeply and speak briefly, or use a familiar form because their own words are not yet available. A question about distant significance is better addressed to oneself or raised within an agreed conversation instead of becoming a test of others. Even when a shared form needs discussion, its conditions can be named: who participates, what the words mean, and whether refusal is possible. Judging every participant's inward correctness from an observer's impression is a different claim for which the observer lacks sufficient grounds.

A ritual may be defended through fear that losing it will remove a connection. That fear can be heard without accepting every demand used to express it. It matters to me that we meet leaves room for discussion. If you change the order, you do not love us assigns a meaning to refusal in advance. In an imagined conversation, participants might first acknowledge the connection's importance and then discuss form separately. This promises no conflict-free outcome. It avoids making one evening the final proof of love or requiring a performed feeling to keep family membership beyond dispute.

V. Returning to conduct, rather than only a former feeling

Revelation2:1–7 addresses the church at Ephesus, acknowledging work and endurance while speaking of a first love left behind; remembrance, repentance, and first works follow. This is a religious address with warning and promise, not a technique for recovering a pleasant emotion. We do not ask a reader to apply its demands regardless of faith. The comparison concerns retained activity with a lost ground, and a return connected with deeds. A personal contemporary question can resemble that structure while remaining a separate question in its own setting. Revelation2:1–7.

If a custom once expressed attention, returning may mean hearing the person again rather than exactly reproducing an earlier evening. In an imagined example, a couple retains a weekly cafe visit but spends the hour discussing other people's affairs without asking about their own concerns. The conversation could change while the cafe stays, or another place could be chosen if this one prevents talking. Novelty is not the criterion. The question is which participation the custom was meant to support and what now makes it possible, with both people's wishes considered.

Sometimes an earlier ground cannot be restored: a relationship ended, someone died, or a shared purpose no longer exists. Demanding return to the original meaning may then conceal an actual change. Remembrance can find another place, and a form may become farewell or preservation of history. We promise neither easy acceptance nor accelerated grief. It is possible to say that a ritual no longer serves its former task and allow time before another choice. An object or date can remain; one action can also be relinquished without declaring the past mistaken or the relationship never to have existed.

Avoid demanding that a loss immediately become growth. Not every ending must yield a new practice, gratitude, or an attractive account. An honest interval may be enough: someone no longer repeats an action and does not yet know what will replace it. Where others share the form, the choice can be communicated and any remaining obligations discussed. Those obligations should not be concealed by talk of personal meaning, but neither do they require an invented feeling. Distinguishing action, relationship, and experience leaves each question its own place.

VI. Transmission can break, and a means can change its place

The opening of Bhagavad-Gita chapterIV in Arnold's translation tells of yoga being transmitted and teaching being lost over time before it is declared anew to Arjuna. This narrative has religious grounds; it is no demonstrated history of every contemporary ritual. For our topic it recalls a distinction between preserving an outward sequence and transmitting understanding. Learning the significance of a particular form may require returning to a source, language, and context instead of only repeating an elder's movements. This contemporary inference is our comparison; the source retains its own meaning. Bhagavad-Gita, opening of chapterIV.

Not knowing a form's meaning does not make someone guilty. Nobody may have explained why an action is customary, and questions may have received only demands to comply. A first step can then be inquiry: learn the history, consult a primary text, and ask about differences between a general prescription and a local form. The answer need create no new obligation; it makes choice better informed. If sources differ or an origin is unknown, that uncertainty should remain. An attractive retrospective explanation is not established history merely because it makes a ceremony seem significant again.

The Buddhist raft in MN22 asks a different question: what does a means serve, and what happens after its purpose is fulfilled? Its context concerns handling teaching correctly before crossing, rather than only leaving it afterward. The image is therefore no permission to drop every difficulty. Within a limited editorial analogy, it asks whether we keep carrying a form whose original task has ended. Answering requires understanding that task, not simply feeling tired. Buddhist liberation is not equated with ending a family custom. MN22, raft passage.

Inquiry and completion are different paths that can combine. Someone learns a history and retains a form, learns it and chooses another way to remember, or recognizes that a task is complete and appreciates the period it served. No response should be compulsory in advance. We do not measure a decision's correctness by the number of rites preserved. Greater relevance lies in accuracy about its grounds, room to discuss a shared cost, and the absence of invented guarantees. Unclear significance can be acknowledged without covering uncertainty through a confident account of tradition or complete personal transformation.

Keeping these paths distinct means not confusing a history's accuracy with present value. An origin story may be mistaken while a gathering still matters to participants. Conversely, a well-supported history does not guarantee that a particular person must continue the current form. An error can be corrected without devaluing every shared experience. Disagreement can be discussed without rewriting the past to fit a convenient conclusion. Remembrance and freedom of decision can then support each other, rather than requiring a desired account to be presented as an established fact.

VII. Revising a shared form

When a ritual is shared, a personal change affects others. This does not oblige someone to continue unwillingly, but practical consequences may need discussion: who prepares, which meeting is expected, what was promised, and what alternatives exist. Begin with one's own experience rather than diagnosing the entire family: this arrangement has become difficult for me; I want to retain the meeting and discuss another option. The statement compels no agreement, but it lets others answer an actual proposal. Declaring all their feelings empty would make the conversation much less precise.

Distinguish the elements: place, date, words, duration, participants, and distribution of work need not carry the same meaning. One can remain, another change, and a third become optional. At an imagined memorial evening, reading a letter together stays while everyone no longer has to make a toast. One participant feels relief, another loses a familiar arrangement. Both responses can be heard. A new version is not accepted simply because its initiator calls it more humane. Actual agreement is needed for genuinely shared action, with clarity about what each person chooses independently.

A small trial with a stated duration is possible if participants genuinely want it. After one meeting they can ask what worked and what was missing. The arrangement need not immediately become final or demonstrate its value through strong emotions. It may prove more convenient while significance still fails to return. That is information for another decision, not a reason to repeat the experiment until a desired answer appears. This is an editorial suggestion, not a guaranteed way to restore relationships. It keeps an attempt, an experience, and an actual agreement distinct.

Sometimes no shared version is found. People may retain different forms of remembrance while staying in relationship. One attends a gathering; another chooses a private conversation or silence. Obligations, where present, need separate discussion. Symbolic participation need not be the sole way to affirm connection. The article promises no easy acceptance of such freedom. It allows disagreement without explaining it through insufficient love for the past. A difference can remain painful while being discussed honestly, without inventing a shared significance that is currently absent.

VIII. Keeping what matters without having to recover the past

The sources ask distinct questions. Confucius defends a ceremony's significance while questioning the quality of a relation; Isaiah criticizes outward honor with a distant heart; Revelation joins return with remembrance and deeds; the Bhagavad-Gita describes broken transmission; MN22 considers a means and its purpose. Their religious and philosophical grounds do not merge into one scheme. Comparison helps avoid choosing too quickly between preserving every arrangement and rejecting all forms. We can first ask what significance was transmitted, what was lost, and who decides about further participation.

A ritual that has lost significance can begin a conversation rather than prove a life finally empty. Someone notices a discrepancy and can clarify their relation to it. The answer may be reconnecting with a source, reducing a form, redistributing work, or naming an ending. It may be keeping an action without demanding vivid feeling. These decisions are no hierarchy of better and worse. Their appropriateness depends on purpose, agreement, circumstances, and obligations. One convenient answer should not become a law for every participant and every tradition.

Respect for what a form once offered can remain even when it is no longer chosen. Gratitude need not become a permanent contract to repeat. Someone can also admit they do not yet want to relinquish it despite unclear significance; that is more honest than an invented explanation. Freedom to revise includes moving slowly. If the question concerns a painful loss or conflict, an appropriate interlocutor may help; the article neither replaces that conversation nor establishes causes of experience. A form should not become the condition for having remembrance, connection, or an answer of one's own.

An outcome can be plain: I want to keep the meeting but change its arrangement; I want to learn its history; I no longer choose this action; for now I am keeping it. Real relationships and particular tasks remain after that answer and cannot be resolved by a formula. Naming the loss, the concern, and the available choice helps stop protecting movement merely for movement's sake. The form may then express significance again, while the person may acknowledge that significance now lives differently. No option requires a promise to bring the past back unchanged.

What this means in practice

Choose one form whose significance has become unclear. Do not choose every family tradition or your whole faith. This reflection is voluntary and can be skipped. Describe the latest occasion: what happened, who participated, what mattered, and what became difficult. Separately note whether significance disappeared or mainly an earlier feeling.

Write three brief answers: what I know about the form's history, what I want to preserve now, and which cost I can no longer bear without discussion. Leave the unknown unknown. You may consult a source or interlocutor, but need not invent an account that already justifies a convenient choice.

If the form is shared, identify one element to discuss: date, duration, words, work, or permission to remain silent. Offer a specific option and hear the response. Do not test participants' love through agreement. For an established religious rite, learn its significance and requirements within the relevant tradition; this article supplies no authority to change it.

Choose a next step: inquire, retain, simplify, agree on a trial, pause, or end. You may postpone a decision when time matters more. Afterward, note what actually changed and what remains open. This exercise guarantees no restored relationship or feeling, is not treatment, and requires no conversion of loss into success. It aims to clarify a relation to a form while leaving participation a personal choice.

Key quotation

> *I love the ceremony*

— Confucius, Analects3.17, short excerpt, translated by James Legge. The reply concerns Zigong's proposal to remove a monthly offering; it does not unconditionally endorse every present-day form.

Connections between traditions

Source or tradition	Question about lost significance	Limit of comparison
Confucianism, Analects3.3–3.17	What does a ceremony preserve, and how does it relate to humanity?	Historical ritual propriety is not every private custom
Jewish biblical text, Isaiah29:13–16	Do outward honor and a relation diverge?	Prophetic criticism before God does not diagnose present participants
Christianity, Revelation2:1–7	What is lost while work remains, and which deeds are recalled?	Religious repentance is not a technique for restoring pleasant feeling
Hindu text, Bhagavad-GitaIV opening	Was understanding transmitted along with form?	Lost yoga is not an established history of a family custom
Buddhist text, MN22	Has a means fulfilled its purpose?	Proper use precedes leaving the raft; liberation is not a household ending
UW editorial reflection	What do I wish to keep, change, or end now?	Voluntary choice, not one universal law or demonstrated therapy

Primary sources

1. Analects, James Legge1893,3.3–3.17. Actual passage reading within the current work is reused without claiming an entire-book reading;3.17 checked for the short quotation.

2. Isaiah29:13–16,KJV. The indicated passage and warning context were read; the epigraph is a short part of29:13.

3. Revelation2:1–7,KJV. The entire indicated address to the Ephesian church was read.

4. Bhagavad-Gita, Edwin Arnold, chapterIV opening. The transmission/loss opening, displayed lines672–705, was read; no full-chapter reading or independent verification of the narrative is claimed.

5. MN22, Thanissaro Bhikkhu2004. Actual snake/raft reading and its context are reused; the Buddhist purpose of liberation and the limits of the household analogy are retained. Contemporary scenes and the reflection belong to UW's editorial argument.

Tags

ritual, meaning, loss, form, tradition, remembrance, family, history, agreement, choice, revision, ceremony, participation, relationships, humanity, feeling, obligation, transmission, source, pause, ending, Confucianism, Judaism, Christianity, Hinduism, Buddhism, comparison, boundaries, autonomy, practice

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.