

UNITED WISDOM

Ordinary life no longer in need of overcoming

Meaning and Direction

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

P-24-N03 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Ordinary life no longer in need of overcoming

Epigraph

> *enjoy the good of all his labour*

Ecclesiastes 3:13, short excerpt, King James Version. The passage calls this a gift of God, rather than a duty to feel contented.

What this article is about

A day passes quietly: work is completed, a conversation takes place, food is prepared. Nothing announces a new level of life. That very absence can raise doubt: am I standing still or missing a chance to become someone else? Wanting change can matter, but it does not establish that ordinary life is itself a defect. We can want to learn, change work or reconsider a relationship while allowing repeated days to have a place of their own. This article explores the distinction through specific historical texts and original illustrations. It does not glorify poverty, demand endurance of injustice or ask readers to abandon large ambitions. Its question is narrower: which difficulty do I actually want to change, and which is created by a demand continually to surpass the life already being lived? Ordinary life can receive room without a ceremonial justification, while its conditions remain open to honest consideration and choice.

I. Ordinary describes scale rather than quality

Ordinary may mean familiar, repeated or unlikely to draw public attention. None of these meanings establishes whether the conditions are good. Repeated work can be useful and fairly arranged, or burdensome and unevenly shared. A quiet evening may be welcome or lonely. We can therefore begin with content rather than the size of an impression. What happens in this day, which relationships does it support, and what requires time? An answer does not become less valuable simply because it is difficult to present as a story of major personal transformation.

In a fictional example, someone visits a friend each Saturday, cooks with them and returns home. No new skill, record or project results. If the time matters to both, its significance already belongs to their relationship; it need not additionally prove development. This does not establish that every familiar meeting is beneficial. If one person attends only from fear of giving offence, another conversation is needed. Being ordinary does not remove the question

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

of consent. It removes only an invented requirement that the meeting must resemble an important event.

Invisibility should also be separated from lack of effort. Maintaining a home, completing promised work and caring for shared arrangements often require repetition. An action may be necessary precisely because its result does not last forever. Food will be needed tomorrow; one conversation will not replace all future conversations. This need not make life a useless return to the starting point. Some acts support present conditions of participation. Recognizing their significance does not, however, assign one person perpetual responsibility for everyone else. Repeated work still calls for discussion of its allocation.

We are not introducing a scale on which quiet lives automatically outrank vivid ones. Performing, creating, travelling or joining a large undertaking may matter deeply. The difficulty concerns an ambition's authority to declare everything else inadequate, rather than its size. An intense period can be preferred without devaluing the ordinary years before it. A quiet period can be chosen without claiming superiority over another person's activity. Scale remains a feature of a choice, to consider alongside desire, capacity and cost rather than in place of them.

II. Enough for what and for whom

Enough becomes clearer when its object is named: enough time for a chosen task, information for a decision or capacity for today's participation. It need not mean final completeness of an entire life. A person can recognize that present work supports important conditions while still seeking another job. A meeting can be appreciated without declaring every relationship question settled. This limited acknowledgment avoids turning each good occasion into a promise of permanent satisfaction, or each unresolved question into the cancellation of everything that already matters.

Sufficiency cannot be assigned to another person in place of their answer. One participant finding a workload acceptable does not establish that everyone does. A household's calm appearance does not reveal its division of duties. In an original illustration, shared life seems well arranged to someone who does little of its maintenance. Another person wants those working conditions changed, rather than ordinary life overcome as such. Hearing the distinction means discussing the allocation itself instead of answering a practical request with a speech about gratitude for what already exists.

Our own criteria can also change. Frequent changes of place and activity may once have mattered; now finishing one undertaking and staying near familiar people may matter more. This does not require a narrative declaring the earlier choice false. Both periods may have addressed different circumstances. The present decision needs a definite object: schedule,

participation, resources or relation to a place. An ordinary form does not become a final destiny. It can fit now and be reconsidered later as information or willingness changes, without invalidating its earlier value.

Making room for ordinary life is therefore no formula that nothing more is needed. Much may be needed: accessible housing, fair conditions, help or the ability to decline. The substantive question is which change addresses an actual difficulty. Continually becoming more impressive can distract from a simple missing condition. Conversely, calling something ordinary can conceal reluctance to name a desired change. No answer has to be chosen for everyone in advance. We can identify what is presently insufficient while leaving the rest of life free from a general accusation.

III. Ecclesiastes: available good and limited knowledge

Ecclesiastes 3:9–15 places a question about labour's profit beside the inability to comprehend God's entire work from beginning to end. It then names rejoicing, doing good, eating, drinking and the good of labour as God's gift. This religious passage promises no convenient life and establishes no psychological efficacy of simple pleasures. Our limited comparison concerns available participation beside the limits of complete knowledge. A person does not possess an ultimate explanation of everything occurring. Acknowledgment of particular good appears alongside that limitation, rather than only after it has been removed. Ecclesiastes 3:9–15, KJV.

In a contemporary example, someone postpones a welcome meeting until they understand whether their whole life is properly arranged. Information may genuinely be needed for some decisions. Yet that general question may not determine whether two people want to meet today. Uncertainty about the future can remain while this conversation is chosen. This is an original comparison, rather than an interpretation of every biblical demand. It does not advise covering important questions with pleasure. It asks which knowledge this participation needs and which additional requirement we have imposed without necessity.

Joy cannot be made into a debt. A difficult evening or demanding care does not prove a wrong relationship with life when pleasure is absent. The text names a gift; our practice introduces no obligation immediately to feel grateful. Food being available, a conversation occurring or work being completed can be acknowledged without requiring a particular inward state. Sometimes the good is help that was received rather than a beautiful experience of the day. Language about what is available should not leave a difficulty unanswered because contentment has already been demanded.

Limited knowledge does not remove available responsibility. If an agreement was broken, uncertainty about history's overall meaning need not prevent discussion. Information about work can be requested separately. Ordinary life ceases to be an object of overcoming when a

particular question receives a particular size. Returning an item, completing chosen work or arranging tomorrow need not await a final verdict on whether life succeeded. Such participation can matter without claiming to explain all existence. An action's limited scope does not make it empty or cancel the responsibility it can actually address.

IV. Confucius: simple conditions do not end learning

In Analects 7.16 (VII.15 in Legge's numbering), Legge names coarse food, water and a bent arm for a pillow alongside joy and rejection of riches and honours acquired through unrighteousness. This does not prove that poverty benefits everyone. Learning, discussion of what has been learned and cultivation continue in the surrounding book VII context. Simplicity and development do not become compulsory opposites. The limited comparison is that life's quality is not determined only by the external rank of what is acquired. Historical social roles are not transferred into a contemporary household or workplace. Analects, book VII, James Legge translation.

Learning can arise from interest without making each activity proof of reaching another level. In an original example, someone reads their city's history to understand the street where they live. Becoming an expert or changing profession is not immediately required. Reading can deepen a relationship with an already familiar place. A larger undertaking may later be chosen separately. Ordinary life does not close knowledge off; it supplies particular questions. Every question need not culminate in a new identity, public role or report of how thoroughly someone has surpassed their previous self.

Rejecting external rank does not require rejecting fair recognition. Payment, accurate authorship or a clear place in shared work can legitimately matter. When work is used without acknowledgment, advice to be satisfied with little does not address the violation. A historical rejection of unjustly acquired honours is no prohibition on decent conditions. Contemporary discussion can separate a wish to impress at any cost from a request that a contribution be named honestly. Allowing ordinary life does not mean accepting its labour as unpaid, endless or without an author. Those remain separate questions.

Nor must pleasure in small things be performed to maintain a worthy image. One person values a familiar place; another wants different surroundings. A simple dinner can be appreciated alongside a wish to travel. These preferences need not exclude each other. The article sets no correct quantity of desires. It returns to each desire's grounds: what matters, what am I willing to pursue, and which costs are acceptable? Once named, these questions allow familiar life to be a starting point for choice rather than an accusation devaluing every relationship and activity remaining within it.

V. Marcus Aurelius: an ordinary act needs no audience

At the beginning of Meditations book V, Marcus Aurelius reminds himself of human work and participation in a shared world. He later compares a good act to a vine bearing fruit and continuing its activity. This belongs to a Stoic account of nature and social conduct. The morning appeal does not become a demand to rise despite illness or perform every assigned task. Severe language about sleep, food and effort remains historical context. Our limited comparison concerns work that need not display personal superiority in order to have a subject and significance. Meditations, book V, George Long translation.

In an original scene, someone helps a neighbour understand a letter. The help was agreed, took a little time and ended. They may tell others or keep the episode private; neither choice determines its value by itself. Trouble arises when participation is assessed only by how effectively it displays a new version of the helper. The neighbour's need then becomes material for someone else's story. A simpler account remains possible: a question arose, help was offered, consent given and an act completed. There is a relationship here without a further declaration of inner progress.

An absent audience does not prohibit feedback. It may matter whether an answer helped, conditions are understood or participation should continue. Necessary confirmation of completed work can be requested. The question's object differs: is the letter clear enough, or do I appear generous enough? Both concerns may arise, but the second should not silently govern the first. If the recipient wants no further involvement, an appreciative story creates no additional duty. An ordinary good act permits an ending, a limited size and the independence of the person to whom it was offered.

The opening also includes returning after failure without requiring faultless performance at all times. Our contemporary conclusion remains editorial: an error calls for a response to its content, rather than proof that an entire ordinary life is unfit. An inaccurate message can be corrected while the familiar day continues. A recurring difficulty can lead to reconsidering an arrangement. Complete self-justification and complete self-overcoming are not the only choices. A particular act, its consequences and an available correction can be considered without assigning a final status to the whole person or life.

VI. A Taoist reading: fewer demands with continued attention

Tao Teh King chapters 19–20 in Legge contain sharp criticism of contrivance, pursuit of gain and the crowd's visible satisfaction. This difficult historical text cannot have its rejection of wisdom and learning converted without explanation into advice to stop education. Chapter 20's differing voice retains its relation to Tao. Simplicity is not a contemporary minimalism technique here. The limited comparison concerns whether every outward sign of an established life must become a demand upon me. That question leaves the original text's ground intact rather than replacing it with a convenient modern slogan. Tao Teh King, chapters 19–20, James Legge translation.

What can be simplified is a claim about what possessions must prove, rather than their quantity. Someone can enjoy a beautiful home without making it evidence of a correct personality. Books can be kept without a monthly obligation to announce discoveries. An evening can remain without a special programme because people simply wish to spend time together. These are possible editorial choices, not Taoist rites or established advice for everyone. A complex programme may be needed and welcome. Its necessity should concern a chosen purpose rather than an inability to let familiar time appear ordinary.

Removing an extra demand may clarify a real task. In a fictional example, someone planned to turn a walk into a daily achievement record, then realizes they presently want to follow a familiar route and see the city. Recording can remain, change or stop. This establishes no superiority of leaving things unmeasured. Information may matter when a route serves specific preparation. The point is freedom to choose an activity's purpose instead of silently converting rest into a test of success. Simplicity allows precision when needed and silence when a report has not been chosen.

Simplicity should not become a new form of perfection. Anxiety about a choice or many desires need not disappear before an ordinary day is allowed. One unnecessary requirement can be reduced while other questions remain. Discussion may clarify conditions; time may be needed. The article offers no unexamined explanation of the reader's feelings. It looks at a particular demand: who established it, what does it serve, and can it be reconsidered? An answer may leave life's complexity intact while removing only a duty to make it continual evidence of surpassing oneself.

VII. A Buddhist householder: conditions also matter

In AN 8.54, Thanissaro's 1995 translation, a householder asks about welfare in present and future lives. The present-life response includes initiative, guarding resources, admirable friendship and livelihood in tune with means, followed by religious qualities concerning the future. This Buddhist framework is neither financial planning advice nor an explanation of modern satisfaction. The limited comparison is that material and social conditions do not disappear behind general language about spiritual aspiration. Ordinary life needs attention to how it is maintained. The list is not transferred into universal rules for every reader. AN 8.54, Thanissaro Bhikkhu.

Every difficulty therefore cannot be answered by suggesting a different attitude. When time is lost through others' unfulfilled duties, allocation needs discussion. Unclear participation calls for information. Work exceeding available capacity may need a smaller scope or an exit. These are contemporary editorial decisions, rather than literal applications of the household instruction. Their shared feature is attention to conditions. Making room for ordinary life does not require remaining in an unchanged arrangement. The arrangement is considered through its actual content, rather than through how elevated the person enduring it appears.

Simplicity must not become a privilege supported by somebody else's care. One person's calm schedule may depend on another's continuous work. In a fictional scene, someone decides to stop chasing achievements and spend evenings at home. If preparing those evenings automatically falls to a partner, the chosen simplicity has an unagreed cost. Cooking, rest and what each person wants can be discussed. Abandoning the race then avoids creating a new duty for someone else. Ordinary shared life can retain meaning alongside everyone's right to participate in arranging it.

Adequate conditions also cannot be promised to produce inward agreement. Even a well-arranged day can contain questions, boredom or doubt. This is no reason to declare the conditions worthless or the person ungrateful. Available support can be acknowledged while a remaining question is considered separately. Another activity may be needed, a relationship may need change, or the need may still be unknown. Distinguishing these matters avoids cancelling everything at once. Maintaining life and choosing its next direction can coexist without first defeating ordinary life or proving that no further change will ever be needed.

VIII. A large ambition can have limits

A large undertaking can be chosen while leaving parts of life outside its improvement programme. Writing a book need not make every friendship a source of material. Preparing a performance does not assign every conversation the purpose of increasing skill. A new project does not temporarily make a day at home unreal. These are editorial illustrations, not universal prohibitions. Others may willingly join an undertaking, and that can be agreed. A boundary keeps participation chosen instead of automatically created by somebody else's goal or a promise that its eventual outcome will justify every cost.

This distinction makes repetition easier to name accurately. Learning may genuinely require exercises; a free hour may also be left outside further practice. Purpose is chosen for the particular activity. In a fictional example, a musician studies one passage, then listens to other music in the evening without analysing technique. Both forms of participation are available. No demonstrated effect of this separation is claimed for everyone. It preserves the possibility that enjoyment need not continually confirm progress, and serious work need not cancel other relationships with the same subject.

After a large undertaking ends, an ordinary day need not become failure because no next summit appears. Completion can receive time, promises can be closed and future wishes considered. A new goal may arise quickly or remain absent. A pause need not be called especially productive in order to be allowed. Unfinished commitments nevertheless remain specific: a deadline needs communication, work needs transfer or an ending needs agreement. A pause differs from silently disappearing from an arrangement. The next large direction can be unknown while nearby relationships and chosen work are handled clearly.

An undertaking may also cease to feel like one's own. One difficult day need not decide this; circumstances, continuing costs and affected people require consideration. Yet continual self-overcoming has no automatic authority to forbid reconsideration. Continuing may be chosen; ending may be more honest. The article offers no universal criterion deciding for the reader. It preserves the possibility of examining present work separately from a duty to remain the hero of an earlier story. Ordinary life after revision does not have to prove itself grander than the undertaking that was left.

IX. An ordinary day can remain without a total verdict

At day's end, separate states may be more useful than a verdict on whether life succeeded. Work was completed, a conversation postponed, tiredness arose, and another undertaking remains desired. None of these statements must explain all the others. Completed work can be acknowledged without concealing what remains. Pleasure can be noticed without demanding continual joy. This is an editorial possibility of language, not an established wellbeing measure. It gives each question a place, so one quiet day need not be elevated to perfection or treated as proof of an entire person's stagnation.

The traditions' differences remain. Ecclesiastes speaks of God's gift and limited knowledge; the Analects of virtue and unjust honours; Marcus of human nature and social conduct. The Taoist chapters pose their own questions about contrivance and collective appearances, while AN 8.54 distinguishes present welfare from religious future qualities. Together they establish no validated doctrine that everyone should live quietly. Our conversation is limited to scale, grounds and conditions. Responses to those questions remain connected with the reader's particular life rather than being settled by assembling several authoritative names.

Ordinary life can be allowed without loving every moment of it. Familiarity need not automatically become an accusation. A difficulty can receive a precise name; something important can be kept without competing with others' impressions. Unclear wishes can remain questions. This stance promises no freedom from doubt. It lets doubt concern a subject instead of silently becoming a demand to cancel the whole of life until a worthier version appears. That may leave more freedom for a real, limited change the person actually chooses, rather than a compulsory performance of total renewal.

An ordinary day then remains a time of participation rather than an examination for permission to have a life. Chosen work, rest, refusal, learning and endings can occur within it. Arrangements may change when there is reason, while suitable parts remain. No advance proof of a uniquely wise or final choice is required. The next question can be modest: what needs attention now? Its answer need not overcome everything familiar. It may deepen life among existing things and relationships, or lead elsewhere. Both possibilities preserve the reader's choice of direction and scale of participation.

What this means in practice

Choose one ordinary day or repeated activity. Do not assess your whole life or search for compulsory gratitude. Name what actually occurs: work, rest, a meeting, home maintenance or waiting for an answer. Separately identify what you wish to keep and what needs change.

Next choose one demand added to the activity. Must it prove development, supply an impressive account or become a new goal? Ask who established that demand and what it serves. Preserve appropriate checking if it concerns real work or an agreement. If it merely prevents time from appearing ordinary, consider reducing it or leaving it unfulfilled.

Identify a particular difficulty in the conditions, if one exists. Do not replace it with advice to be content. Allocation of work can be discussed, information requested, participation reduced or another conversation chosen. Propose changes affecting someone else with room for them to decline.

Finally distinguish what occurred, what remains open and what you currently choose. These statements need not form a total verdict. A familiar activity can remain outside an improvement programme while an important ambition continues elsewhere. This is an original voluntary exercise in clarification. No demonstrated psychological efficacy or compulsory outcome is claimed, and the exercise establishes no duty to choose quietness over learning, ambition or departure.

Key quotation

> *Riches and honors acquired by unrighteousness*

Confucius, Analects 7.16 (VII.15 in Legge's numbering), short excerpt, James Legge translation, 1893 edition, Sacred Texts transcription (spelling honors). The saying compares them to a floating cloud; it does not prohibit fair recognition.

Connections between traditions

Comparison	Support	Difference and limit
Available good with limited knowledge	Ecclesiastes 3:9–15	God's gift and fear before God, not compulsory satisfaction or a psychological technique.
Simple conditions alongside learning	Analects 7.16 (VII.15 in Legge's numbering) and opening of book VII	Virtue and unjust honours, not glorified poverty or prohibition of recognition.
Ordinary social action	Marcus V, opening and vine image	Stoic nature; severe effort and destiny demands not transferred into contemporary conditions.
Questioning visible establishment	Tao Teh King 19–20	Relation to Tao and difficult rejection of learning, not a modern minimalism programme.
Material and social conditions	AN 8.54, Thanissaro 1995	Present and future lives distinguished, not financial advice or guaranteed satisfaction.
Choosing scale and a particular change	Original meeting, walk and household scenes	Ordinary life preserves consent, fair allocation and freedom to revise arrangements.

Primary sources

1. *Ecclesiastes* 3:9–15. King James Version, Bible Gateway. Entire named passage read; religious gift and limited knowledge are not a duty to feel joy. RU epigraph is UW's own translation via English. https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Ecclesiastes%203%3A9-15&version=KJV

2. Confucius. *Analects* 7.16 (VII.15 in Legge's numbering) and opening of book VII. James Legge, 1893 edition, Sacred Texts. Sayings 7.1–6 and context around 7.16 (VII.15 in Legge's numbering) read; historical roles not transferred into contemporary requirements. RU key fragment is UW's own translation via English. https://sacred-texts.com/cfu/conf1.htm

3. Marcus Aurelius. *Meditations*, opening of book V, conventional numbering 1–9. George Long, Internet Classics Archive. First nine fragments and translator identification read. Stoic social activity is not a demand to work despite illness or accept every injury as good. https://classics.mit.edu/Antoninus/meditations.5.five.html

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

4. Lao-tse. *Tao Teh King*, chapters 19–20. James Legge, Project Gutenberg 216. Both chapters read in the displayed translation; rejection of learning and relation to Tao retain their own context rather than advising abandonment of education.
https://www.gutenberg.org/files/216/216-h/216-h.htm

5. *Dighajanu (Vyagghapajja) Sutta*, AN 8.54. Thanissaro Bhikkhu, 1995, Access to Insight revision 30 November 2013. Full short discourse, notes and version information read; reading reused from the current task. Site warns of possible outdatedness. Present welfare and future religious qualities retain distinct horizons.
https://accesstoinsight.org/tipitaka/an/an08/an08.054.than.html

Source 2 numbering was checked against Legge, Book VII, chapters XV–XVI: the saying about coarse food and unjust honours is XV; the neighbouring XVI concerns the Yi. The English quotation retains honors from Sacred Texts; the numbered parallel displays honours.

Tags

ordinary life, everyday life, sufficiency, choice, change, simplicity, scale, participation, work, rest, learning, desire, conditions, consent, allocation of labour, justice, recognition, promise, completion, uncertainty, joy, knowledge, ambition, Ecclesiastes, Confucianism, Marcus Aurelius, Stoicism, Taoism, Buddhism, 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.