


UNITED WISDOM

# The Difference Between a Symbolic Gesture and Changed Conduct

Meaning and Direction

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

P-22-N02 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

# The Difference Between a Symbolic Gesture and Changed Conduct

## Epigraph

*“Prove your words by your deeds.”*

Seneca, Moral Letters to Lucilius, 20.1, translated by Richard M. Gummere. A brief sentence within an argument about living according to philosophy.

## What this article is about

After a difficult conversation, someone brings flowers, writes a long letter, or arranges a reconciliation dinner. Each may express a sincere wish to restore a relationship. Yet the following day the conduct at issue returns: an agreement is broken again, another person’s work is claimed, or a request is ignored. This calls for a distinction between a gesture’s meaning and changed conduct. A symbol can state an intention, mark a beginning, or preserve a memory. A concrete action changes what we do in a situation and may also require repairing damage already caused. The two need not compete: a sign can accompany change. One does not automatically establish the other. This article examines their boundary through historical texts and original everyday illustrations. It offers neither a universal scale for judging sincerity nor a promise that the right gesture secures forgiveness. Its question is more specific: what actually happened after the declaration of change?

## I. A gesture and conduct answer different questions

Here, a symbolic gesture means an act whose principal significance expresses a relationship or attitude: a memorial candle, a thank-you letter, a chosen sign of beginning. This is a working definition, rather than a definition of every religious rite. Conduct is examined from another angle: what does it change in a particular interaction? The same dinner can symbolize reconciliation and contribute to care when someone undertakes the cooking and clearing for the first time. The distinction concerns the question asked, rather than the object involved.

Suppose someone gives a book to express gratitude for help. The gift may adequately express appreciation if no further obligation existed. If they also promised to return a borrowed item, however, the gift does not fulfil that agreement. It communicates something meaningful while answering a different question. We can therefore begin with the original promise’s content. Disappointment does not always establish that a gesture was empty. Sometimes the sign was



@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

sincere but failed to supply the particular action another person reasonably expected in that situation.

The distinction can be named without accusing someone of hypocrisy. “Your words matter to me; I also want to understand how the work will be shared” makes room for meaning and agreement. The response may reveal that no change was promised: the person intended only to express regret. The conversation remains unfinished, but becomes clearer. The participants can decide whether they want a new arrangement and what it should involve. Directly naming a possible action, with room to decline, reduces the need to infer intentions from flowers or silence.

Conversely, demanding a measurable result from every sign misunderstands its purpose. A memorial letter need not repair anything; gratitude does not always imply a debt; religious worship has meaning within its own tradition. Practical clarity starts by identifying what was actually claimed. A gesture expressing an attitude can be received as expression. A gesture declaring change raises an additional question about subsequent conduct. When used to close an unfulfilled obligation, it calls us back to the obligation itself and the conditions under which it was undertaken.

## II. Words clarify a commitment before fulfilling it

Analects 4.22 and 4.24 compare speech with conduct: restraint in words concerns the possibility of failing to live up to them. This belongs to Confucian character cultivation, rather than a modern reliability test. The useful boundary here separates a promise from its realization. Speaking may be necessary for another person to learn an intention. The announcement does not establish that the required action has occurred. This distinction preserves the value of words while leaving their fulfilment open to examination in the circumstances that follow.

“I will be more considerate now” offers a direction but leaves much unclear. Considerate about deadlines, requests, or the allocation of time? In this original example, a colleague repeatedly reschedules meetings at the last moment. A definite change might involve checking the calendar before inviting others and giving timely notice when a change becomes necessary. This guarantees no perfect record, but identifies the commitment. Others need not continually guess whether another clash is an exception, a return to the previous arrangement, or a consequence of conditions never agreed.

Clarification should not become a contract for the impossible. Never feeling irritated or always anticipating another person’s needs is difficult to make the object of honest responsibility. An accessible action can be named instead: stop an argument before insults, request time to respond, and return at an agreed moment. Conditions matter. If someone lacks time or

authority to undertake a proposed duty, that should be established before solemn agreement. A limited, workable promise offers more clarity than a sweeping declaration whose attractive language conceals predictable difficulties.

Some acts are performed in words: consent, refusal, acknowledgment of error, or a clear warning. Speech is therefore a real part of conduct. Its particular effect matters. “I decline” can establish a boundary; “I was mistaken” corrects a prior statement; “I will return it tomorrow” creates an expectation of future action. These cases should remain distinct. Admitting a broken promise changes the conversation’s truthfulness without returning the item to its owner. It can begin repair while keeping an accurate name for what remains to be done.

## III. A reconciliation sign does not replace repair

In the Zacchaeus narrative, Luke 19:1–10, an encounter accompanies declarations of support for the poor and restitution. The passage connects the scene with salvation and belonging to Abraham’s household. It cannot become a modern price for forgiveness or a fourfold repayment rule for every conflict. The limited comparison is that acknowledgment does not remain merely a new self-image. Material actions towards other people are named in the narrative. Their subject differs from the joy of the encounter and the wish to be received in a new role.

In an everyday example, someone presents another person’s text without attribution. Public thanks may express respect, but repair requires restoring the name where the text appeared. If the mistaken version has circulated, the correction’s reach matters. A beautiful new post may never reach the earlier audience. The responsibility determines the action: accurate authorship is at issue, rather than general goodwill. What the correction says and whom it reaches matter more than the number of solemn words about newly valuing honesty or the attractiveness of the announcement.

Repair can be incomplete, and that deserves acknowledgment. Some things can be returned; some consequences cannot be undone. Paying for a damaged object does not return the evening spent managing the damage. Possible restitution need not promise restoration of the entire past. It requires learning what was affected, what contribution is available now, and which decisions belong to the other person. Choosing compensation without discussion, mainly for our convenience, can once again turn the recipient into a participant in a scenario we have already written for them.

Even completed repair establishes no entitlement to forgiveness, renewed closeness, or the previous degree of trust. Those decisions are not rewards that correct conduct allows us to demand. Someone may acknowledge repayment while retaining distance. That does not make repayment meaningless: it addresses a particular debt or harm. Turning repair into a bargain

for immediate reconciliation fails to respect the recipient’s freedom. A more honest position allows the available action to be performed independently of whether the hoped-for response follows or the relationship is restored.

## IV. A gesture’s meaning belongs beside the treatment of people

Isaiah 58:1–12 places criticism of fasting beside oppression, burdens, and care for people in need. A bowed head and visible humility do not close the question of justice. This is a prophetic address within a particular religious history; its promises are not clinical health predictions. The relevant comparison concerns observance alongside the treatment of people. It neither declares fasting unnecessary nor licenses judgment of all believers through one episode. It asks that actual interactions remain visible beside an expressive image of piety, rather than disappearing behind it.

In an original illustration, an organizer holds an appreciation evening for volunteers while continuing to assign tasks without agreement. The event may be warm and worthwhile. It still does not answer a request to discuss workload beforehand. Relevant change involves being able to decline, understand the work, and choose participation. If celebration becomes proof that no difficulties remain, recipients again lose room to identify the problem. Gratitude retains its meaning when actual conditions can be discussed alongside it, rather than participants merely confirming the mood they have been offered.

This examination does not reduce care to completed operations. A formal procedure can coexist with humiliation through tone, public comments, or selective attention. Specificity therefore concerns how an action occurs as well as whether it occurs. Considerate notice of rescheduling differs from a message blaming its recipient for being inconvenienced. Another person’s experience still provides no automatic knowledge of every intention. We can hear that conduct caused difficulty and clarify the circumstances without making the discussion a contest over who deserves to consider themselves a good person.

Traditions should not be reduced to identical advice about politeness. Prophetic justice, Confucian cultivation, and a Christian salvation narrative have their own grounds. Our reading poses a limited shared question: which actions appear beside the declared meaning? It establishes no single mechanism taught by every source. It preserves the difference between a substantial text and a convenient slogan extracted from it. This limit matters particularly when we are tempted to support a personal demand with the combined authority of several religious and philosophical names.

## V. Changed conduct needs feedback

MN61 considers bodily, verbal, and mental actions before, during, and after performance. In the selected Thanissaro Bhikkhu translation, reflection concerns affliction to oneself and others; harmful conduct calls for stopping and future restraint. This is Buddhist training, rather than a ready-made secular monitoring programme. Its severe language about shame is not adopted here as an exercise in self-humiliation. The limited comparison is the possibility of returning to consequences instead of treating a good initial intention as conclusive confirmation that every completed action was beneficial.

Suppose we decide to help someone by reminding them of their tasks each day. The intention may be caring, yet they say the reminders feel supervisory and disruptive. Merely explaining our kindness leaves the conduct unchanged. Feedback calls for asking whether help is wanted, in what form, and with what freedom to stop it. A possible change may be simple: ask before reminding or agree on one convenient time. This does not establish that the earlier care was false; it makes its expression more appropriate to that relationship.

Not every criticism should instantly determine our conduct. Requests can conflict; circumstances can be unknown; some decisions lie beyond our ability. Receiving feedback means considering its content, rather than abandoning judgment. We can acknowledge inconvenience and explain the available options. We may discover that a requested action violates another agreement and seek a different response. What matters is that discussion does not end with a general assertion of good intentions when a particular effect has been identified and a substantive answer remains possible.

Checking should remain proportionate. We need not demand daily reports of someone’s feelings to establish that our changes were noticed. An agreed review point or an accessible event may suffice: notice actually arrived, attribution was corrected, or work was redistributed. The recipient need not become a permanent inspector. If repair needs another person’s involvement, we should establish whether they are willing. Otherwise our attempt to prove change creates additional work for the very person whose interests we said the changed conduct would serve.

## VI. Visible results do not reveal an entire inner life

Letter20 compares words and a way of life while acknowledging the difficulty of consistency: a shared path does not imply constant speed. Later, Seneca distinguishes visible poverty from one’s attitude to it. This qualifies our topic: an expressive appearance does not reveal its entire inner basis. The article does not transfer his voluntary-poverty advice to contemporary readers. Creating deprivation is not required to prove seriousness. The limited point is to distinguish a visible sign, a chosen intention, and the actual work involved in changing particular conduct.

Completed conduct does not make a person transparent either. Someone may repay a debt through respect, fear of conflict, or several motives at once. We need not establish every motive to acknowledge repayment. Trust in future promises may still require more than one event. These states can be named separately: the action occurred; its inner meaning remains unknown; I currently choose a limited further arrangement. This allows a concrete result to be recognized without a hasty verdict on the entire person or a duty to forget earlier experience immediately.

Not every meaningful change produces an immediately visible outcome. Someone may withdraw an unfair accusation that nobody knew they intended to make, or prepare a calm response instead of the habitual mockery. These changes concern an available choice and need no public performance of proof. Invisibility should not, however, become a universal explanation for an unfulfilled promise. When an agreement concerned a specific task, internal effort can be respected while acknowledging that the task remains undone. Both statements can be true together without treating the effort as worthless.

It is therefore more useful to examine a change’s content than assign a final status of sincerity. What differs in speech, shared care, or decision-making? Which consequences are known, and which remain to be seen? Where has someone acknowledged a limit instead of making a new sweeping promise? These questions need not turn life into virtue accounting. They return conversation to what can actually be discussed. We retain room for caution and acknowledgment without demanding infallible knowledge of another person’s inner life or treating one successful episode as irreversible transformation.

## VII. A gesture can support change without replacing it

A beginning sign can be appropriate when its meaning is agreed. People might choose a date for a new arrangement, write a brief promise, or remove an object associated with the previous pattern. This guarantees no success. It makes a transition visible and provides a way to name its direction. In an original example, a family marks a new division of household work with dinner. The meal expresses agreement; the arrangement and subsequent actions address the work. A pleasant dinner cannot be entered in place of unchanged responsibilities.

A meaningful object can recall a chosen action. A note near a desk invites a pause before sending a harsh message; a ring recalls a commitment; a phrase returns attention to a question. These possibilities establish no demonstrated psychological effect for every reader. They are original ways of expressing meaning, available for trial, revision, or refusal. If preserving the reminder becomes the chief concern while the letter is sent in the old manner, we can ask what the sign now serves and which action has been left unattended.

Shared gestures require shared agreement. An unwanted embrace cannot be declared a reconciliation ritual, and a photograph cannot establish restored trust. Participation in a form is distinct from our intention in proposing it. Several ways of marking change can be offered, or the change can proceed without ceremony. Declining a gesture need not prevent fulfilment of an agreement. Conversely, joining a dinner does not accept every future condition. An event’s meaning becomes clearer when its limits are named before a photograph or account fixes a convenient version of what happened.

A sign can be preserved while an excessive claim about it is withdrawn. “This evening mattered to me” need not mean everything is repaired. “These words help me remember” does not establish that I will always act well. A smaller claim need not diminish meaning; it can express that meaning more honestly. Symbolic significance and practical responsibility can coexist when each retains its name. Beautiful gestures need not be destroyed for conduct to remain visible. They simply should not be assigned proof that they cannot provide by themselves.

## VIII. Change includes the next difficult occasion

After a striking declaration, the first successful action is easier to notice. An agreement usually concerns the next occasion too, when timing is inconvenient, resources are limited, or the former response feels attractive. This is no reason to arrange secret tests. Ordinary difficulties can be discussed beforehand: what happens when a deadline moves, who gives notice, and how an unfinished task is resumed. Change then acquires conditions for continuation. The ceremonial moment no longer carries responsibility for the whole future, and an error need not call for another ceremony instead of repair.

One lapse and a recurring pattern call for different conversations. The first may involve clarifying circumstances and repairing a particular consequence. The second requires examining whether the promise fits actual capacities and whether willingness to fulfil it remains. Repeated explanations need not be false, but their plausibility does not perform the task. Honest change may mean declining a duty one cannot undertake and agreeing another allocation. This is less ceremonial than renewed unlimited willingness, yet allows everyone to make decisions on the basis of understandable conditions.

The next step can be smaller than the original plan while remaining substantive. Instead of promising constant help, someone undertakes one task at an agreed time. Instead of declaring a complete end to harshness, they correct one message and choose an available response to the next. Size is not the only measure of seriousness. Does the action address the real question, and does it conceal a transfer of costs to others? A small step is not the entire change; a large intention is not already fulfilled merely because it was expressed with strong feeling.

Maintaining change does not mean continuing harmful arrangements to prove consistency. New circumstances may reveal that an agreement needs revision. A participant can name this and discuss an exit, especially when conditions have ceased to be voluntary. Clear communication and responsibility for available consequences distinguish revision from simply disappearing. A commitment’s form can change without declaring earlier participation false. Consistency can concern an honest relationship with circumstances, rather than preserving at any cost the public image of someone who never revises a decision.

## IX. The distinction makes room for meaning and limits

A conversation can end with several accurate statements rather than one sweeping verdict. A gesture was received as regret; one error was repaired; a new agreement has been fulfilled on one occasion; trust is partly restored or remains unsettled. These states need not share a timetable. Naming them separately allows someone to recognize a good action without performing complete reconciliation. Equally, the gesture’s author need not declare it worthless merely because the hoped-for response did not arrive immediately after an occasion that was both beautiful and sincere.

The sources retain different horizons: philosophical coherence in Seneca, character cultivation in the Analects, justice before God in Isaiah, encounter and salvation in Luke, and purification of action in MN61. They cannot be assembled into one validated technology of change. A limited conversation about words, signs, and conduct can leave each source its own ground. Reading in this way calls for fewer sweeping promises and closer attention to what a text actually says, including the conditions and purposes that an attractive general slogan might omit.

In our own lives, the distinction supports a manageable question: which action fits this intention here? The answer may be material, verbal, or organizational: return something, correct a statement, give notice, ask, or withdraw an impossible promise. A beautiful sign may accompany it but is not required. Appropriateness concerns particular people and conditions, rather than the impression created. We can appreciate symbolic expression while continuing a conversation about what still needs to change or about an inability that should be acknowledged honestly rather than concealed by further declarations.

Changed conduct promises no final immunity from error. It shows an available way of acting differently and remains open to consequences. A symbolic gesture need not prove that change in order to matter. It can express what is actually intended without claiming another person’s consent or declaring unfinished work complete. With these limits clear, meaning need not compete with responsibility. We can mark something important, repair something specific, care for a relationship or end it honestly, without requiring one expressive moment to accomplish every task for everyone involved.

## What this means in practice

Choose a modest situation in which you declared a change. Examine your own conduct rather than test someone else’s sincerity. Record what was said and which gesture accompanied it. Separately identify the original question: an unfulfilled agreement, a difficulty caused, gratitude, or the beginning of a new arrangement.

Ask what the gesture expresses and what it cannot establish by itself. A letter of regret does not establish an item’s return. A dinner marking agreement does not allocate subsequent work. If no further obligation existed, do not invent one to complete the exercise.

Name one available action addressing that question. Specify its conditions: timing, information needed, and another person’s involvement. Promise neither faultlessness nor forgiveness. Ask first when consent is needed, preserving the possibility of refusal. If harm occurred, consider specific repair without treating it as a purchase of closeness.

After acting, record what is known about the result and what remains open. Completed work can be acknowledged alongside continuing caution. If a further difficulty appears, clarify it and choose a proportionate next step. Keep a symbolic sign if you wish, as an expression of meaning, while retaining a separate account of what was done. This is an original exercise in clarity and responsibility; no demonstrated psychological efficacy or power to restore every relationship is claimed.

## Key quotation

> *“deal thy bread to the hungry”*

Isaiah 58:7, King James Version. A brief clause within a prophetic address about fasting, justice, and care.

## Connections between traditions

| Comparison | Specific support | Difference and limit |
|---|---|---|
| Words and a way of life | Seneca, Letter20.1–6,11–13 | Stoic coherence, not faultlessness or advice to create poverty. |
| Restraint in promising | Analects4.22–24, Legge translation | Character cultivation, not a universal sincerity test. |
| Fasting signs and treatment of people | Isaiah58:1–12, especially5–7 | Prophetic justice, not rejection of all observance or a medical forecast. |
| Acknowledgment and restitution | Luke19:1–10, especially8–10 | Salvation narrative; fourfold repayment is not transferred into a modern rule. |
| Reviewing consequences | MN61 mirror and action before/during/after | Buddhist training; severe shame language is not an exercise in self-humiliation. |
| Meaning and a particular commitment | Original letter, attribution, dinner and reminder illustrations | Limited comparison; a gesture or completed duty purchases neither consent nor forgiveness. |

## Primary sources

1. Seneca. *Moral Letters to Lucilius*, Letter20 §§1–13. Richard M. Gummere translation; displayed Loeb1925 edition, with first printing1918 noted. Whole letter and title information read; voluntary-poverty advice is not transferred to readers. https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Moral_letters_to_Lucilius/Letter_20

2. Confucius. *Analects*4.22–24. James Legge,1893 edition, Sacred Texts. Named sayings and adjacent context read; historical social roles are not contemporary requirements. https://sacred-texts.com/cfu/conf1.htm

3. *Isaiah*58:1–12. King James Version, Bible Gateway. Whole named passage read; prophetic promises are not clinical outcomes. RU quotation is UW's own translation from English. https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Isaiah%2058%3A1-12&version=KJV

4. *Luke*19:1–10. King James Version, Bible Gateway. Whole narrative read; no price for forgiveness or modern restitution formula inferred. https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Luke%2019%3A1-10&version=KJV

5. *Ambalatthika-rahulovada Sutta*,MN61. Thanissaro Bhikkhu2006; Access to Insight revision30 November2013. Instruction text read with preceding truthfulness context and conclusion. The site warns this version may be outdated; no updated-version reading is claimed. Severe shame language is not adopted as self-humiliation practice. https://www.accesstoinsight.org/tipitaka/mn/mn.061.than.html

## Tags

symbol, gesture, action, conduct, promise, commitment, responsibility, repair, restitution, reconciliation, consent, refusal, trust, forgiveness, gratitude, intention, consequences, feedback, care, truthfulness, justice, consistency, ritual, Seneca, Confucianism, Isaiah, Luke, Buddhism, everyday life, spiritual 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.