

UNITED WISDOM

Inner Loneliness: Why Feeling Separate Is Not the Same as Having Nobody Around

The Person and the Inner World

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

I17 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Inner Loneliness: Why Feeling Separate Is Not the Same as Having Nobody Around

Epigraph

> *“...why art thou disquieted in me?”*

Psalm 42:5 in the King James Version's numbering, 1611; a short excerpt. In traditional Russian biblical numbering, this is Psalm 41. The context is addressing one's soul and hoping in God, not a clinical account of loneliness.

What this article is about

Imagine an evening after meeting friends. It was noisy, conversation never stopped, and several people hugged you goodbye. At home, a strange emptiness remains. The photograph shows you spent time together, yet it is difficult to find a moment when you felt truly met. Explaining this feels awkward: how can you complain of loneliness when people were there, invited you, listened to your jokes, and did nothing wrong?

This article explores the inner experience of separateness. The number of meetings, other people's kindness, available help, and felt closeness are connected but do not replace one another. It matters to understand what is missing: being known, shared meaning, one particular person's presence, trust, or a form of communication that is not currently possible. We will not infer a diagnosis from one evening or declare the friends insufficiently good. Practical ways to build communities are a separate subject. Our task is more modest: give the experience precise language without turning it into proof that nobody needs you or you cannot be alongside others.

I. Presence and closeness answer different questions

People's presence can be described from outside: who was in the room, how long the conversation lasted, which messages arrived. Closeness also needs considering from within: whether connection was felt, what became shared, whether participation was possible outside a familiar role. A photograph of a gathering and loneliness can therefore coexist. The first does not disprove the second. It only limits the conclusion that there were no people at all.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

CDC distinguishes social isolation from loneliness: isolation concerns missing contact, relationships, or support; loneliness concerns feeling disconnected and lacking meaningful connection. The page explicitly allows loneliness among people with many friends. This is an official public-health definition, not a diagnosis of a particular reader. We use only the conceptual distinction here, without applying statistics or lists of risks to one evening.

In a hypothetical scene, someone receives many work messages. Each confirms the team's need for them, but none concerns what occupies them beyond the task. After a day of correspondence, they say, “I'm alone.” Claiming that nobody exists would be inaccurate. Something else may be more precise: today people interacted with me as a worker, and an encounter beyond that role did not happen. This description preserves existing relationships while naming a missing layer.

It need not devalue useful communication. A work contact can be warm and important even without providing closeness. A conversation about the weather can sustain ordinary human kindness. Not every interaction must satisfy someone's entire request. A problem arises when one kind of connection becomes a final answer to the absence of another: “You get so many messages—what loneliness?” A visible fact then becomes a way of not hearing inner experience.

The first distinction removes the need to choose only one truth. You can be grateful for people around you and long for closeness. You can receive help and lack words for something important. You can value relationships and feel separate within them. None of these combinations gives a final assessment of your life's quality. They invite examination of where connection exists and where it is not yet felt.

II. Being noticed does not always mean being known

Attention takes different forms. You may be noticed as funny, intelligent, reliable, or attractive. These judgments need not be false. Yet they describe what others see in a familiar scene. Wanting to be known may concern another part of experience: doubt, loss, a new interest, a changed outlook. If only the familiar image is present in the room, praise does not always answer that request.

Imagine someone who usually enlivens gatherings. Today they feel bad but tell stories again because conversation flows easily that way. Friends laugh, and the evening succeeds. Later the person feels separate. This does not prove friends use them or cannot listen. Perhaps another part was not indicated; perhaps it was indicated but found no room. The feeling alone cannot decide between those possibilities.

“What part of me was present?” is more precise than “Why does nobody understand me?” You can recall specific content rather than your entire character: you wanted to discuss moving,

but conversation stayed around work. You wanted to sit silently without explanation, but every pause was filled. You wanted to share an interest that does not yet interest others. Different absences need different names; “understanding” is too broad to settle them immediately.

You are not obliged to reveal everything to deserve closeness. Privacy and gradual acquaintance remain rights. If naming an important part is difficult, do not demand immediate disclosure from yourself as a cure for loneliness. Sometimes acknowledging that the shared image has become narrower than experience is enough. A next step may appear later, with a suitable person and safe conditions, or may remain unchosen for now.

Another person's view cannot contain you completely either. Even close people know some sides better than others. Requiring one person to see you fully creates a task without clear conditions for completion. A more limited question leaves room for real connection: which part matters to share now, and what response would be meaningful? Presence can become more precise without becoming total knowledge of one another.

Being known can also lag behind change. In a hypothetical case, your view of an important issue has already changed, but friends keep responding to your former position. This is not necessarily deliberate ignoring: new information may not have appeared. Distinguish whether you want interest in the change or require the other person to know it beforehand. This preserves your own history without turning someone close into a reader of unspoken thoughts.

III. A role helps an encounter and sometimes closes it

A familiar role simplifies interaction. A friend knows whom to ask for advice; colleagues know who organises a meeting; a family relies on someone who remembers details. A role can be voluntary, valuable, and suitable. Separateness begins not with the role itself but, in a hypothetical situation, where no other way of being present is possible yet. Someone becomes recognisable without having room to change.

Imagine a usually calm participant is angry today. Others answer, “That's not like you.” The remark may express surprise or close the conversation. To distinguish them, consider what happens next: does interest in the event appear, or a request to return to the old image? One sentence cannot establish intention. A sequence of actions can show whether new content is allowed into these relationships.

The person also participates. They may withhold a story in advance, believing others will not want to hear it. They may present only the part that has long received approval. This does not make them guilty of loneliness. The observation merely adds a possible area of choice to a picture otherwise determined entirely by others' reactions. Real grounds for caution and the right not to disclose remain.

A role's difficulty is especially noticeable when it brings recognition. A reliable person enjoys being needed; a funny person creating ease; a strong person supporting others. Change then does not look like pure liberation. A familiar, valued place might be lost. An inner wish for closeness may coexist with wanting to retain exactly this way of participating. The conflict needs attention rather than an accusation of insincerity.

A role can be explored on a small scale without abandoning it completely. In a hypothetical conversation, someone does not entertain everyone but says they would prefer to listen today. Another does not immediately advise but shares their own uncertainty. The outcome is unknown beforehand. Observation helps understand relational conditions rather than setting an examination friends must pass to count as worthy.

IV. Another person does not become my extension

In the *Nicomachean Ethics*, book IX, chapters IX–X, Aristotle considers friendship and living together as sharing words and thoughts rather than merely occupying the same place. This is an ethical and philosophical argument within his account of a good life. The friend as a “second Self” is not a contemporary model of merged personalities. It cannot be used to require a friend to match every feeling or decision.

The paradox of closeness is that it is precisely another person who meets us. They can respond without being obliged to feel the same. In a hypothetical case, you describe an important book, and your friend does not share the enthusiasm, yet listens closely and asks questions. This can be connection without matching tastes. Accepting an encounter only where agreement is complete makes a meaningful part of actual attention invisible.

Separateness is not rejection. A friend may not understand an experience they have never had or may choose unfortunate words. What matters is whether clarification is possible, interest remains, and “I need something different now” can be said. The article does not promise every conversation will succeed after clarification. It suggests not making the first mismatch a conclusion that connection is impossible altogether when further information is available.

Patience should not erase a lasting absence of interest either. If a subject is repeatedly dismissed, ridiculed, or used against you, this is more than a noble difference between two personalities. Real conditions of respect are needed. Our argument does not suggest explaining indefinitely to obtain an acceptable answer at last. Misunderstanding and bad treatment are distinguished by behaviour, context, and consequences, not a beautiful idea of accepting another person.

Clarification is therefore mutual. We ask what response we need and recognise the limits of another's capacity to provide it. Perhaps this is not the person for this conversation. That discovery need not cancel the whole friendship. Relationships can be valuable in other forms.

Not every mismatch must be corrected; not every absence can be addressed to the same person.

V. Sometimes it is precisely the absent person who is missing

Not every longing for closeness can be satisfied by new company. When a particular person is absent, additional meetings are not their equivalent. This is especially apparent after loss, separation, or a changed relationship. This article establishes no grief stages and explains no individual's reaction. It retains a simple limit: the number of available listeners does not replace the unique content of a connection with someone not currently there.

Imagine a family celebration after a close friend has moved away. People are attentive and conversations warm, but someone is missing who understood one joke without explanation. This is not an accusation against those present. They need not become that person. You can acknowledge both: the gathering is good, and a particular connection is absent. Without that acknowledgement, you must either devalue the celebration or blame yourself for being unable to enjoy it.

In Psalm 42:1–5 in the KJV, longing addresses God and accompanies a memory of a festive gathering. This is a prayerful, poetic religious text, not a theory of social needs. A limited image matters to us: memory of former fellowship and present longing do not contradict each other. Resemblance in human language does not turn religious hope into a psychological technique.

A specific absence can be named without requiring its immediate removal. “I miss talking specifically with him” is more precise than “People give me nothing.” The first leaves other relationships open while allowing irreplaceability. Sometimes distance contact is possible; sometimes it is not. A reader need not obtain a practical result from acknowledging loss or separation itself.

Support need not replace the absent person either. Someone else can remain beside your longing without occupying the empty place. This is an independent form of connection: experience becomes shareable even while its cause remains. We promise no relief from such presence. Yet it shows that the absence of one connection and the existence of another can remain two true parts of life.

A lack of closeness is sometimes noticeable after a change of language or environment. You may communicate sufficiently but not yet find the nuances previously used for important things. This is a hypothetical example, not an explanation of every person who has moved. It shows that inner separateness may concern available expression rather than an absence of kindness. Keeping the distinction leaves a question about communication's form open rather than condemning the whole new environment beforehand.

VI. Expecting a response has a form

“I need closeness” seems clear until the response that would matter must be identified. One person needs interest in details, another the possibility of not explaining everything verbally, another shared activity. Sometimes advice is needed, sometimes precisely its absence. If the response's form remains undefined, the other person can try yet miss the request. This is an opportunity for clarification, not an accusation that every lonely person communicates badly.

Imagine you describe a difficult day and a friend immediately offers a solution. They may understand help as action, while you first wanted to be heard. Missing the needed response does not prove an absence of care. If safe, you can say, “Thank you; right now I'd rather talk a little.” This is not a magical sentence. It simply creates further information through which both people can see whether intention matches the needed form of participation.

The opposite occurs too: long, attentive listening does not answer a wish for practical help. Someone feels separate because the conversation remains sympathetic while the difficult task still rests with them. A need for action should not be shamefully translated into “I'm insufficiently understood.” Emotional response and available support can be separated. The other person can state their limit, and you can understand your own request more accurately.

Closeness's form cannot be required always to be guessed. Some relationships involve great familiarity, yet familiarity does not eliminate change. What helped before may be irritating or insufficient today. Clarifying new content does not make the former connection false. Sometimes the retained connection is precisely what allows saying today's experience differs without devaluing shared history.

A request does not oblige the other person to satisfy it immediately. They may be busy, tired, or unready. A refusal can hurt even when respectful. Distinguish a limit to one meeting from a general verdict on your importance. One “I can't today” is not “I don't need you” without further grounds for that conclusion.

The request itself can be contradictory: you want someone to ask and fear answering. In this scene, their silence hurts while a question makes you want to close down. This does not establish personal malfunction. Both wishes can be acknowledged while seeking an acceptable pace, such as a short conversation without an obligation to continue. Disclosure should not be promised always useful: its meaning depends on subject, listener, safety, and your own decision.

VII. “Nobody needs me” goes beyond the available facts

Feeling separate can easily accompany a general conclusion about personal importance. But “I couldn't share something important today” and “Nobody needs me” have different scopes. The first may describe an episode accurately. The second claims knowledge of every relationship, time, and possibility. Loneliness does not supply that knowledge automatically. Its strength deserves attention but does not enlarge the available facts.

In a hypothetical scene, two people did not answer a message. You did not write to a third, believing they would refuse too. The evening felt empty. Its pain can be acknowledged while seeing the sequence separately: two replies have not arrived yet, and one contact was not attempted. This is no instruction to write to the third person against your wishes. It avoids recording an untested assumption as a refusal that already happened.

The opposite inaccuracy is collecting proof of being needed to refute the feeling. “Look, twelve people wished me a happy birthday, so loneliness isn't allowed.” That count may confirm social attention without answering the felt absence. Facts need not be forced to destroy the feeling. It is more useful to limit the general verdict while preserving an experience that still needs understanding.

If few relationships are actually available or support is absent, that must also remain in the picture. This article does not promise every separateness will disappear through precise wording. Material conditions, language, schedules, health, and environment can limit possibilities. We do not investigate every factor here or turn mentioning one into an explanation of a particular case. Inner experience is considered alongside reality rather than replacing it.

A specific sentence offers less dramatic certainty but more room for the next question. “It's hard to find someone I can discuss this with now” allows examination of subject, form, timing, and conditions. “Nobody needs me” closes all four in advance. You cannot order yourself to abandon such a story immediately; you can notice where it exceeds what is known.

VIII. Closeness does not cancel a separate life

Even a deep connection does not transfer all inner experience to another person. Someone experiences their illness, choice, memory, or decision in the first person. A friend can support without living it in their place. This limit need not mean relational failure. It needs language allowing separateness inside closeness rather than declaring them opposites.

Imagine someone making an important professional decision. Their partner listens, helps calculate consequences, and stays beside them. The choice still has to be their own. Loneliness of responsibility may be felt then. We cannot know beforehand whether this is the

reader's experience. In the hypothetical scene, what matters is that the partner's presence does not disappear because authorship of the decision itself cannot be shared.

Aristotle's sharing of words and thoughts is useful as a philosophical image, not complete transparency between two people. Each retains what is unknown, changing, and their own. Requiring every inner distance to disappear subjects closeness to an impossible condition. Real connection can include questions, pauses, misunderstanding, and returning to a conversation, although that possibility needs confirmation in relationships rather than assumption from an attractive formula.

Separateness can be noticed without romanticising it. It can be difficult and does not make someone spiritually superior to people who find company easier. This article does not suggest calling every longing a beautiful existential experience. If respect or support is missing in a relationship, philosophical separateness should not conceal that absence. The possibility of incomplete understanding and the need for acceptable treatment are different questions.

The distinction avoids requiring closeness to eliminate human separateness completely. Sometimes more limited presence is enough: someone knows this choice is hard and does not leave you alone with every practical consequence. Sometimes that presence is absent. Either way, facts can be named more precisely without treating the limit of any relationship as proof of its meaninglessness.

A separate life should not be confused with a demand to cope without help. You can remain the author of a decision and need information, money, time, or participation. Support need not remove authorship. If “independence” hides a prohibition on asking, the question of closeness becomes narrower still. It helps to see the specific rule: who demands it, what it applies to, and whether real limits of human capacities are allowed.

IX. The evening can be seen in several dimensions

Return to the meeting with friends. Instead of the overall judgment “I was alone among people,” examine different layers: what was pleasant, what was truly shared, what stayed unnamed, which response was desired. Perhaps the evening was good in one form and insufficient in another. This description is less impressive than condemning every relationship, but it does not force a choice between gratitude and honesty.

You may discover you were tired and could not participate as usual today. You may see a particular subject that found no room. You may recognise an absent person others do not replace. A more lasting mismatch between existing relationships and desired closeness is also possible. We do not know the answer in advance. The article does not offer its possibilities as your history; they simply prevent collapsing different experiences into one conclusion.

If the feeling recurs and noticeably interferes with life, reading may be insufficient. NHS indicates the possibility of professional support when coping is difficult; diagnosing yourself is not required. Immediate danger to your safety needs local emergency assistance. This boundary does not make every lonely evening an illness. It means the article should not become the only permitted source of support in a severe condition.

Acknowledging separateness does not require an immediate program of social activity. The next decision may be a conversation, pause, clarification of conditions, or only naming the experience for now. Change can be observed without demanding closeness from every new meeting. People need not become tools for testing an article, and you need not report a correct emotional outcome to it.

A meaningful change begins where loneliness stops being life's only description. It remains a real experience, but relationships, absences, roles, wishes, and the unknown appear beside it. The number of people does not prove closeness; a feeling of lack does not prove all connection absent. Between these two limits lies the possibility of considering your particular evening rather than delivering a final verdict on the person who lived it.

What this means in practice

If the subject feels familiar, choose one manageable episode and describe it without diagnosis. Who was present, what conversation happened, and when did separateness appear? There is no need to search your entire biography for a cause. Leave the question open and first name only what occurred and what you noticed. If considering the episode becomes too difficult, stopping and choosing other support is allowed.

Then finish one sentence: “In this encounter, I missed...” Retain specific content: talking about an important change, sitting silently together, practical help, a particular person's presence. Several answers can coexist. You need not choose the most elevated or convenient one. Specificity distinguishes requests without guaranteeing that each can currently be satisfied.

If you wish, consider one safe clarification. For example, tell an acquaintance you would like to describe a new subject briefly without advice, and ask whether they have time now. This is neither a test of love nor compulsory disclosure. The answer may provide information about this form of communication's availability. The other person retains the right to be unready; you retain the right to notice disappointment and seek another possibility.

Choose beforehand what would count as an observable outcome: you named the subject, received a clear answer, saw a conversational condition, or decided not to disclose yet. The disappearance of loneliness is not required as proof of success. If a particular absent person is missing, clarification may lead to no replacement at all. Keeping irreplaceability and noticing available support can be neighbouring decisions.

Clarification can remain private. It need not be published or presented to everyone at the gathering for your experience to be real. If you later decide to discuss it, choose one person and one question. A complete account does not become the price of the right to attention.

Key quotation

> *"...sharing in his words and thoughts..."*

Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, book IX, chapter IX; English text of Project Gutenberg no. 8438 with J. A. Smith's introduction; a short excerpt. The translator is not established from the publication details read in this copy; the specific version read is identified in the source list. The context is a philosophical argument about friendship and a good life, not a promise of complete mutual understanding.

Connections between traditions

Comparison	Intersection and boundary
CDC ↔ Aristotle IX	Having contact differs from meaningful connection; a public-health definition does not establish an ethical theory of friendship.
Aristotle's sharing of thoughts ↔ being known in conversation	Shared life includes meaningful participation; our scenes are editorial applications, not empirical results of the treatise.
Psalm 42:1–5 KJV ↔ longing alongside a memory of gathering	Former fellowship and present longing can be named together; hope in God is not reduced to a social technique.
CDC ↔ role and presence	Contacts do not refute an inner absence; a person's particular role and motives require clarification.
Aristotle ↔ separateness within closeness	Togetherness need not cancel the other person; the modern distinction is not declared the ancient author's literal doctrine.

Sources

• CDC, *Health Effects of Social Isolation and Loneliness*, 15 May 2024. The substantive page was read; only definitions and the possibility of loneliness among friends were used. Statistics and individual health predictions are not inferred.

• Aristotle, *The Nicomachean Ethics*, book IX, chapters IX–X, Gutenberg no. 8438. The argument about friends and shared life and the discussion of the number of friends were read, along with introductory metadata. English version with J. A. Smith's introduction; identification of the translator from this copy is limited.

• Psalm 42:1–5, King James Version, 1611. The specified passage was read; exact numbering and boundaries of the religious perspective are retained.

• NHS, *Feeling lonely*, page reviewed 22 July 2026. The substantive page was read; limited support for seeking help is used. British services' availability is not promised to international readers.

Tags

loneliness, separateness, closeness, presence, social isolation, meaningful connection, attention, being known, roles, privacy, friendship, support, separation, absence, irreplaceability, understanding, mismatch, expectation, response, autonomy, inner experience, facts, unknown, voluntary participation, Aristotle, CDC, Psalm, hope, shared life, boundaries

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