


UNITED WISDOM

# The Cost of Repeatedly Postponing What Matters

Meaning and Direction

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

P-23-N04 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

# The Cost of Repeatedly Postponing What Matters

## Epigraph

> *always add procrastination to procrastination*

Epictetus, Enchiridion, section L in the read Thomas Wentworth Higginson edition. Exact five-word fragment addressed to a student of Stoic philosophy; it is not a judgment on everyone who finds starting difficult.

## What this article is about

Some tasks spend a long time in the future tense: I will talk, find out, return it, choose, begin. Each postponement can make the decision seem unchanged, with only its date moved. Yet the situation may change meanwhile: someone continues waiting, an available opportunity closes, a promise becomes less dependable. This article considers that cost without demanding immediate action on everything. We distinguish justified waiting, refusal, and repeated promises that bring action no closer. Seneca, Epictetus, and the Letter of James provide different grounds for discussing time and conduct. Their historical and religious positions remain distinct from contemporary examples. This reflection neither explains every difficulty nor offers treatment or a method for increasing productivity. Its limited question is what actually happens while something called important remains undecided again, and what honest response is available under present conditions.

## I. A postponement changes more than a date

Imagine a folder of photographs someone promised to send a sister after a family gathering. The task seems small and repeatedly yields to other work. A month later, the sister is making the album without those pictures; after two months, she asks whether she can count on receiving them at all. More than the sending date has changed. The basis of her plans and the meaning of the promise have changed too. This example establishes no general law, but shows why a delay's cost may lie beyond personal inconvenience. A small task can belong to someone else's sequence of actions.

Cost here does not mean converting every minute into money or utility. A missed conversation has no universal price available from a table. What may be lost is availability, clarity, confidence in a particular promise, or an opportunity to choose among several paths. Sometimes there is no substantial loss: nobody is affected, conditions remain stable, and



@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

action is genuinely unnecessary yet. Naming a cost therefore means describing a particular change, rather than accusing oneself in advance of wasting life. Such examination may reveal a need to act; it may also remove a false sense of urgency.

It matters what has been called important. One person means an accepted obligation, another a personal wish, a third somebody else's persistent demand. These grounds are different. A promise to deliver materials connects people differently from a wish to learn drawing someday. A request never accepted does not become a duty merely because its maker repeats it. Combining everything into one list of important things can lead someone to serve other people's expectations while continuing to avoid a personal decision. The first distinction concerns the task's basis; only then come its timing and an available form of action.

Repetition also needs description rather than a label. Three postponements might reflect three different circumstances: a missing document, an ill participant, an openly changed priority. They might instead repeat the same promise without examining its conditions. The number alone establishes neither the cause nor a judgment about character. A more useful question is whether new information or a new reason appeared between postponements. When every later date rests only on another later date, the task remains without a responsible decision, even if the intention seems persistent. That limited situation is what the following discussion examines.

## II. Waiting can be a real decision

Not every delay is avoidance. Acting now may require another person's decision that has not arrived, or a resource one has no authority to use. Choosing a date for a shared trip depends on participants' agreement; sending somebody else's notes depends on the author's permission. Waiting in these cases preserves the other person's participation. An immediate gesture meant to demonstrate decisiveness could violate that very right. A response to repeated postponement therefore cannot rest on the instruction to begin alone. First establish what makes an action possible and permissible, and what remains unknown or dependent on another person's decision.

The difference between waiting and an indefinite postponement may lie in a stated condition. Sending something after the author's permission names a basis that can be checked. Sending it when things are more convenient can be a reasonable preliminary answer, but after several repetitions it no longer explains what convenience depends on. A condition need not be an exact calendar date. It may be an event, a reply, a check of availability, or the completion of another commitment. Its purpose is to make waiting intelligible, rather than create another rigid deadline that will be broken. An unidentifiable condition is also relevant information for participants.

For some tasks, the honest decision is refusal. Someone keeps promising to join an optional club despite no longer wanting the activity. Moving the date may seem like a way to remain friendly, while the organiser continues counting an additional participant. Refusal can disappoint, and its effects should not be dismissed. It does, however, give the organiser a clear basis for revising plans. This applies to new or voluntary participation; it does not erase an accepted commitment through an inward decision alone. Where a commitment exists, changes need discussion with the people affected by it.

Justified waiting may include a small available action: explaining a condition, checking permission, or acknowledging uncertainty. That action does not automatically replace the main task. Saying that one remembers does not deliver the photographs; checking a calendar does not create agreement for a trip. A preliminary step means only what it actually changes. With limited capacity, even that step may be unavailable, and this article sets no minimum effort for everyone. The distinction helps describe a situation; it gives an outsider no authority to prescribe exertion or demand private circumstances as proof of a valid delay.

## III. Seneca acknowledges loss and his own imperfection

In his first letter to Lucilius, Seneca distinguishes time taken away, time that slips away, and time lost through one's own carelessness. His argument belongs to a Stoic concern for living in awareness of mortality. He urges attention to today's task rather than endless dependence on tomorrow. In the same letter, however, he admits that he cannot boast of wasting nothing: he can identify what he loses and how. That turn matters. The teacher does not present himself as the owner of a perfectly organised life. Acknowledging an observable expense stands beside his demand to preserve time.

A contemporary reader might cautiously apply that question to one recurring situation. Someone notices an intention to answer a letter about a shared meeting each evening, followed by opening other messages first. No conclusion about the whole life is required. If observed, the sequence can simply be named: a reply depends on choosing a date, while choosing a date keeps giving way to browsing correspondence. The cost is particular too: the other person cannot complete the arrangement. This is an original illustration, not Seneca's explanation or an established behavioural mechanism. It permits discussion of one action without judging an entire personality.

Seneca's language about mortality should not become a means of pressure. A finite life does not establish an obligation to fulfil every request today, undertake a difficult conversation, or abandon rest. Finitude grants no authority to another person and cannot replace examination of conditions. Necessary care, work, or another limit may make action unsuitable now. What matters then is an honest description rather than a dramatic reminder of life being lost. The historical text offers a reason to notice time; this contemporary reflection preserves the right to

distinguish available, obligatory, and currently impossible action without shame about having limits.

Acknowledging a loss can be small and private. Not returning an object because no meeting was arranged is more precise than saying that one's whole relationship with time is terrible. The first description leaves several responses open: arrange a meeting, propose another delivery method, or explain the delay. The second turns an episode into a broad personal trait and says little about what the other participant needs. Even an accurate description guarantees no later action. It merely reduces uncertainty about this task. Where the issue exceeds voluntary reflection, this article prescribes no further assistance and claims no professional assessment of causes.

## IV. Epictetus asks about application, not accumulated intentions

In section L of the read Enchiridion, Epictetus addresses someone already acquainted with philosophical principles. He asks why this student still waits for another teacher and assigns new days for self-reformation. The following section LI distinguishes applying principles, demonstrating them, and examining their logical connection; the example concerns not lying. The criticism targets replacing conduct with discussion of its grounds. This is a particular Stoic programme, including a demanding ideal of following reason. It cannot simply become advice to complete more tasks or a demand for immediate obedience to any instruction from somebody else.

Suppose someone in a shared project decides to stop promising unexamined deadlines. They read about reliability, write down a rule, and tell friends why realistic agreements matter. Then they again answer definitely tomorrow without checking their schedule. In this original example, a new intention changes nothing about the point being assessed: the promise remains unexamined. Application might mean checking availability before replying or honestly stating that the deadline is unknown. It need not involve a dramatic resolution or a transformation of character. The difference lies in the particular message on which another participant will base their plans.

Preparation is not therefore always evasion. Understanding the grounds is necessary for some actions: agreeing to unknown conditions simply to demonstrate decisiveness would be irresponsible. One can investigate while clearly stating that a decision has not yet been made. The difficulty arises when preparation is presented as a completed decision or becomes the only response to an existing agreement. These sources provide no automatic threshold of sufficient knowledge for every situation. This article instead suggests checking a description against the task's state: what has been established, what remains open, and what result, if any, is actually available to another participant.

Stoic severity also needs a boundary here. Language about negligence, contest, and missed perfection belongs to instruction addressed to a particular student; it is no established explanation for every delay. This article uses it neither to blame people with limited resources nor to demand endless self-monitoring. The reader may postpone the reflection itself. Where it is available, one distinction between stated intention and observable conduct is enough. A more accurate description may be modest: still choosing, never having agreed, or having promised without delivering. These states differ, even when outwardly no completed result is visible in any of them.

## V. A future plan does not mean owning the future

James 4:13–17 addresses people confidently describing future trading and profit. Tomorrow is unknown, and life and action depend on the Lord’s will. The final verse concerns knowing good without doing it. This is neither a ban on planning nor a promise that a devout plan will succeed. It connects confidence, finitude, and conduct within Christian faith. Reducing it to a task-management rule would remove the ground on which the author speaks. Its religious meaning remains explicit.

Consider a contemporary example: someone plans to meet an older relative after a busy season. That may be reasonable; the relative's age creates no entitlement to an immediate visit or pressure through fear of consequences. But saying when does not guarantee that both people will remain available later. They might examine whether they share an understanding of the future and propose an available form of contact if it suits both. No preservation of the relationship or special emotional experience can be promised. This example concerns conditional plans and present agreement, rather than an obligation to compensate today for every possible future loss.

The distinction between hope and agreement becomes particularly clear in repeated postponement. Hoping to be free communicates desire and uncertainty. Saying that one will be free offers another person a basis for action. If conditions remain unexamined, a confident form can increase the cost of waiting: the other person may decline another invitation or keep an evening open. Hope is not itself deceit; what matters is not presenting it as established availability. An honest reply may be less comforting and less convenient. It allows the other participant to decide whether to wait, choose an alternative, or decline the proposed event altogether.

Uncertainty cannot be eliminated by perfect wording. Even an examined promise can meet changed circumstances. Reliability then depends less on claiming control over the future than on responding to change: noticing an affected agreement, sharing available information, and discussing another option. This is original reasoning about shared life, not an interpretation of God's will or a professional standard for obligations. It leaves room for chance, limits, and

error. Responsibility is different from guaranteeing an outcome. Someone can take responsibility for making and revising a promise without having the power to secure every future condition of its fulfilment.

## VI. Another person's waiting belongs to the cost

A delayed task is often described in the first person: this is difficult, I am busy, I ran out of time again. These facts may be true and relevant. Where another participant is involved, however, the description remains incomplete without their position. A person waiting for a book's return may need it for a class; someone awaiting a meeting reply cannot tell whether an evening is free. Their need does not automatically outweigh one's own limit. The more modest implication is that a limit and a dependency should be named separately, so a decision does not rest on only one participant's experience.

A situation is especially opaque when secondary elements are completed while another person's dependency remains. A participant discusses the design of a shared invitation, suggests attractive versions, and says the project matters. Yet the venue they promised to confirm remains unknown. Useful work may genuinely have been done and need not be dismissed. It has nevertheless not settled the venue's availability. The cost comes from activity failing to meet the agreement's object, rather than from total inactivity. Naming this requires identifying the promised result and whether another participant can actually use it now in their next decision.

Discussing a dependency need not require a detailed justification. Saying that the venue cannot be confirmed and should not yet be relied on communicates a relevant limit. Personal reasons need not all be disclosed. The other participant may revise the plan rather than wait for clarification. Honesty guarantees neither universal satisfaction nor release from the consequences of an already broken promise. It offers a clearer basis for the next decision. That limited value should not be inflated into a promise of restored trust, resolved conflict, or an obligation for the other person to understand and accept the delay.

Unequal relationships also exist, in which revising a promise freely is difficult. A shortage of time may reflect how work, care, and resources are distributed rather than a single personal choice. This article does not offer philosophical history as a substitute for changing those conditions, or instructions for dangerous situations. Within voluntary everyday reflection, one may notice which part of a task belongs to personal choice and which requires other people's involvement or an environmental change. The distinction removes neither a need for practical support nor the fact that some conditions cannot be changed by the individual alone.

Sometimes both sides name limits they cannot reconcile: one needs an answer today, while the other cannot provide it today. This is a real difference, not necessarily a wording problem

that attentive conversation will solve. They may acknowledge that the shared option is currently unavailable. Giving it up can preserve clarity even when the desired result is lost. In that case, postponement carries the cost of maintaining the appearance of a plan that does not actually exist. Acknowledging absent agreement judges neither participant and need not make the difference permanent. It names this arrangement's present state under these conditions.

## VII. Preparation, beginning, and completion have different results

One way of postponing something indefinitely is to quietly rename the result. Someone intended to return an object, then chose to find suitable packaging, then listed delivery options. Those actions may be appropriate stages. The object nevertheless remains with them. Saying that the matter is practically settled may suggest an imminent handover to the recipient, although neither method nor time has been agreed. Distinguishing stages is not a demand for bureaucratic reporting on life. It serves accuracy in an ordinary conversation. Preparation means preparation; its value does not require calling it the completion that has not yet occurred.

Another example is a letter written but never sent. Working on the text may require attention and time; that effort should not be treated as nonexistent. The recipient has nevertheless received no reply and remains with the earlier uncertainty. One can distinguish having a draft, deciding whether to send it, and actual delivery. Not every written letter should be sent: its writer may change direction or choose a conversation. What matters is that a completed draft cannot prove communication has occurred. Feeling relief after writing also establishes neither the other person's awareness nor their agreement with anything in the message.

Completing an action is also different from achieving everything desired. Sending a question does not mean receiving an answer; proposing a meeting does not mean restoring a relationship. Treating a first step as the whole outcome hides further conditions. Refusing to recognise any step until final success, however, can dismiss an available action. Between these extremes lies an accurate description: the question has been sent and the answer remains unknown. That description requires neither success nor failure as a personal verdict. It keeps the real change visible while leaving open what depends on other people, circumstances, and further decisions.

Accuracy becomes especially important after several delays. A fresh promise can feel like a new fact because it sounds more confident than its predecessor. Confidence in wording adds nothing to the result's availability. One might check whether conditions, participation, or the next action have changed. If none has, another deadline remains an estimate. It can be described as such, or left unset until there is a basis for it. The issue is not never making a

mistake about time. It is distinguishing an estimate, an accepted arrangement, and an actual result when other people are relying on them.

## VIII. A next action need not settle an entire life

When many delayed tasks accumulate, trying to settle them all at once may not fit real conditions. This article identifies no universally most important task and prescribes no order of care for everyone. If available now, one situation can be examined: what commitment exists, who is waiting, what remains unknown, and what another delay would change. Choosing a small scale does not mean the other issues are unimportant. It limits the reflection's object so that it does not become a demand for a full account of one's life. The selected situation may reveal that further individual action is currently impossible.

An available step may be organisational rather than emotional. Someone feels no special determination but can check where the promised object is or who is entitled to receive it. Another person cannot complete the main task but can explain the absence of a confirmed deadline. A third decides to decline a voluntary activity. These options form no ranking from weak to strong; they respond to different conditions. None guarantees relief or lasting behavioural change. Their meaning lies in a particular alteration to the task's state, describable without relying on a special inward feeling or a dramatic sense of resolve.

Changing a commitment needs discussion separately from wishing to escape an uncomfortable question. If another person has incurred costs, accepted a condition, or declined an alternative, a revision affects their choice. Proposing a revision does not amount to releasing oneself unilaterally. One can acknowledge that the original plan is not being fulfilled and describe a proposed change without presenting the other person's agreement as already secured. This article determines no legal or professional consequences of promises. It keeps visible the ordinary distinction between proposing a new arrangement and its actual acceptance, which personal wording or desire alone cannot create.

After a chosen step, one can pause and see what actually changed. An object has been found but its handover is unarranged; a message has been sent but has no reply; a refusal has been expressed but its consequences remain. There is no need to add a promise that everything will be different now. If another delay occurs, an earlier accurate fact does not disappear. It may become a basis for reconsidering conditions, without requiring a verdict of total failure. Pausing also applies to reflection itself: it is voluntary and may be unsuitable now, without any demand to prove an acceptable reason.

## IX. What matters receives time or an honest new description

Sometimes the word important survives by habit after a desire has changed. Someone keeps saying they will resume an old activity, yet no longer chooses it even when time is available. That proves neither its lack of value nor an outsider's right to decide for them. The person can nevertheless examine whether the former intention describes a present choice. Giving up an old formulation may acknowledge change rather than failure. While the decision remains unsettled, calling it open can be more accurate than announcing an inevitable future action unsupported by a current wish or an available basis for doing it.

In another case, the wish remains but its former form is unavailable. Someone wants to join a gathering, yet the old schedule conflicts with necessary care. Repeatedly postponing that same form may conceal an opportunity to discuss another one if it suits everyone. There may be no alternative. Then a clear decision's value differs from obtaining what was wanted: it simply ends a promise without a present basis. The loss may remain painful. This article calls it neither a compulsory lesson nor evidence of growth. Honesty allows regret without requiring an invented positive outcome from a closed possibility.

The sources share a limited question about words and conduct unfolding in time. Seneca's preservation of time, Epictetus's application of philosophy, and James's religious condition on plans rest on different grounds. They form no unified theory explaining postponement. Contemporary examples add agreement, availability, and another person's waiting as original reasoning. The comparison therefore claims no research into effectiveness. A modest possible result is noticing one place where the promised, the desired, and the actually available have diverged, then naming that difference without a final judgment on oneself or another person. Even that observation remains optional rather than a required outcome.

The cost of repeated postponement does not always call for speeding up. A response may be action, agreed waiting, declining optional participation, or acknowledging an impossible deadline. What matters is changing the available basis rather than moving a confident phrase to another day. Time does not become fully controllable, the other person need not agree, and the desired outcome remains conditional. The particular task can nevertheless receive a more accurate place in shared life. That is enough for a limited discussion of responsibility, without demanding instant perfection or turning the future into endless storage for promises made in the present.

## What this means in practice

If suitable now, choose one task that has already been postponed. There is no need to list everything outstanding. Name its basis: an accepted promise, a personal wish, another person's request never accepted, or an open choice. Any note may remain private.

Separate three questions: what is known about available conditions, what requires somebody else's agreement, and what changes while the task waits. Do not replace a missing answer with a judgment about character. Unknown information can remain unknown, especially where clarification requires details unavailable now.

Consider one appropriate option: an available action, a condition for waiting, declining voluntary participation, or proposing a revision to a commitment. A proposal does not mean the other participant has agreed. Preserve necessary care and existing obligations while considering this voluntary reflection.

Afterwards, record only what occurred: a question asked, a deadline unconfirmed, a condition explained, an object still undelivered. Promise no permanent transformation. You may stop at the distinction or postpone reflection altogether. This practice has no established effectiveness and cannot replace assistance requiring professional involvement.

## Key quotation

> *While we are postponing, life speeds by.*

Seneca, Moral Letters to Lucilius, I.2, Richard M. Gummere translation; read exemplar reprinted 1925, first printed 1918. Exact seven-word sentence. A Stoic reminder about time, not a demand to complete everything immediately.

## Connections between traditions

| Question | Seneca, Letter I | Epictetus, L–LI | James 4:13–17 | Comparison limit |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| What is postponed | Today's task and use of time | Applying already known principles | Trading and profit plans | Different objects, not one task list |
| Time's meaning | Finite and slipping away | Present application matters | Tomorrow is unknown and depends on the Lord | Religious grounds remain explicit |
| Beyond words | Observing one's own loss | Conduct beyond demonstration alone | Doing known good | A shared question is not one doctrine |
| Speaker's position | A teacher admits his own losses | Instruction to a prepared student | Christian moral address | Its tone is not imposed on every reader |
| What cannot be promised | Full control of time | Instant perfection | Certain success of a future plan | No effectiveness claim is established |
| Original application | Name a particular postponement | Distinguish intention and completed step | Distinguish hope and agreement | Conditions, consent, and another person's waiting remain separate |

## Primary sources

1. **Seneca, Moral Letters to Lucilius, Letter I**, read text, Richard M. Gummere translation. The parent volume's title states reprinted 1925 and first printed 1918. Whole I.1–5 actually read, including admission of personal losses; key sentence checked in I.2. Mortality and carelessness imagery supplies no pressure, diagnosis, or demand for constant busyness.

2. **Epictetus, Enchiridion, L–LI**, read edition, Thomas Wentworth Higginson translation. Liberal Arts Press exemplar: first edition 1948, second 1955; its note identifies minor language editing. Both sections read completely; L–LI follows this exemplar's numbering. Epigraph checked in L. Severe instruction to a student does not explain every delay; modern introduction and closing borrowed maxims provide no grounds for this article.

3. **James 4:13–17**, King James Version, historical English version 1611. All five verses read in the displayed version. The Lord's will, conditional future, and responsibility for known good retain their Christian meaning. No guarantee of successful planning follows; no exact English quotation from this passage is used.

## Tags

postponement, time, responsibility, promise, waiting, agreement, intention, action, decision, importance, uncertainty, future, hope, availability, conditions, completion, preparation, commitment, refusal, limits, shared life, care, Seneca, Epictetus, James, Stoicism, Christianity, philosophy, primary sources, honesty, reflection, United Wisdom

## 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.