

UNITED WISDOM

Solitude You Want and Loneliness That Weighs on You

The Person and the Inner World

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

I-10-N02 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Solitude You Want and Loneliness That Weighs on You

Epigraph

> *“...rest a while.”*

Mark 6:31, King James Version, 1611; a short original fragment. Jesus invites the disciples in the narrative to withdraw after activity and people's constant arrival; this is a religious text, not a universal prescription for solitude.

What this article is about

Imagine two evenings in the same room. On the first, you decline a meeting, silence your phone, and happily stay home. On the second, the meeting is cancelled without your participation, nobody answers, and silence feels empty. The walls, chair, and number present are identical. Experience differs. One time you wanted space for yourself; another, available connection that is not happening now. A photograph of an empty room cannot reveal the difference.

This article considers chosen solitude and burdensome loneliness while allowing overlap. It does not prove you must love being alone or prescribe obligatory company. Consider desire, actual conditions, a way out, and experience's change over time. Inner separateness among people is examined separately. Here the question is specific: what does being without company mean right now? A Stoic perspective, a Gospel scene of respite, and today's distinction between social isolation and loneliness offer different foundations; they become no single doctrine or promise of benefit from silence.

I. An empty room does not reveal what someone wanted

Absent company is an external circumstance. Wanting to be alone, feeling close, and available support are other questions. You can choose an evening without people knowing someone is available tomorrow. You can be alone in a room against your choice. You can welcome silence and miss a particular person simultaneously. The circumstance establishes neither sufficient connection nor a felt lack automatically.

CDC distinguishes social isolation and loneliness: absent contacts and support differ from a subjective lack of meaningful relationships. We use these concepts narrowly without applying health risks to one evening. Solitude as a chosen form of participation is our editorial

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

distinction, not another diagnosis from that page. The person's answer matters rather than assuming external aloneness already explained their condition.

Imagine an acquaintance sees a photograph of your walk and asks why you are alone again. Perhaps precisely that walk was desired. Perhaps you wanted company but nobody could come. No answer should be invented from the picture's style or number of posts. The same route can be chosen rest, involuntary waiting, or mixed experience. The difference becomes available through content you are willing to name yourself.

The first clarification therefore requires no assessment of character. “I wanted time without conversations” and “I have nobody to discuss something important with” describe different requests. The first establishes no inability for closeness, the second no lack of independence. Both wishes can occur in different hours. Words specify today's experience without assigning a permanent role of lonely or self-sufficient person.

Visible enjoyment is no criterion either. Someone calmly stays alone without special pleasure; another entertains themselves without obtaining desired connection. The article does not require beautiful solitude. It can be ordinary, working, or boring. To understand a chosen evening, consider its conditions and desire without demanding an aesthetic image of someone wonderfully befriending themselves.

II. Choice includes revising a decision

Chosen solitude need not mean ideal freedom. Every decision occurs within limits of money, time, place, and obligations. Yet clarify whether a manageable alternative exists and revision is available. Leaving a gathering voluntarily and being excluded are different events. “My choice” should not erase closed opportunities that remain a significant part of the situation.

Imagine someone prefers an evening at home after a full week. An hour later, a short conversation becomes desirable. Change makes no original decision erroneous or insincere. Writing to a friend, if suitable, or leaving the wish for tomorrow are options. Notice new content without defending the initial choice until evening ends. Authorship includes revision rather than only firmness in the first decision.

Available contact cannot be assumed, however. Perhaps nobody will answer now, the person lives far from loved ones, or the needed communication is absent. Desire and reality then diverge. The article promises no repair through correct naming. An evening can be acknowledged as beginning chosen and becoming burdensome. A mixed story is more precise than declaring every hour either good solitude or proof of an unsuccessful life.

Alternatives sometimes exist only formally. Going to a noisy event is not obtaining needed closeness; calling an unsafe person is not support. Any technically possible contact should not

count as sufficient freedom of choice. Quality, respect, and safety belong in the picture. Recognising limits removes no independence; it assesses available decisions without invented abundance of options.

“Can I change the evening's form?” therefore concerns specific conditions. Perhaps a walk, brief message, reading, or quiet presence beside someone is available. Perhaps no suitable option exists yet. An obligatory exit to people is unnecessary. Preserve revision and honest knowledge of limits so “solitude” does not become an attractive signboard for unwanted missing connection.

III. Wanting silence does not reject relationships

Limiting communication can concern its form rather than people. You may not want to explain, answer questions, or sustain a shared pace. These are hypothetical possibilities, not every reader's history. Wanting a pause does not automatically mean absent love or interest. Loved people can matter while an hour without conversation is preferred. Relationships require no continuous presence as the sole proof they exist.

Imagine someone tells a partner after a gathering, “I'd like some time alone.” The partner may hear rejection although time and demands were intended. If safe and possible, specificity helps: what pause, which contact is available later, what still matters? No sentence guarantees understanding. It adds information rather than requiring someone flawlessly to guess an inner wish's meaning.

A pause may affect shared work, however. A partner needing agreed help calls for a specific discussion of leaving. Silence's attraction grants no right to shift the entire load. A wish can be acknowledged together with inability to satisfy it immediately in the chosen form. An agreement concerns participation, time, and distributing work, not general permission for one person to have a separate inner life.

In the Gospel scene Mark 6:30–32, disciples are invited to withdraw and rest after activity amid people's constant arrival. They withdraw together; this is no image of complete social separateness. The religious narrative allows noticing that a pause from communication's flow can be shared. We turn it into neither medical advice nor an ideal schedule for a contemporary person.

Solitude therefore sometimes concerns reduced demands rather than every person disappearing. Sit silently together, each pursue something separate, decline a large event and choose a calm meeting. If available and desired by both, the form preserves connection without the former load. Otherwise it should not be treated as a guaranteed solution. Seek a suitable form without blaming yourself for a contradiction between silence and closeness.

IV. A Stoic distinction does not replace actual help

In Epictetus's *Discourses*, III, 13, George Long translation, being solitary differs from absent people: a trustworthy person capable of helping matters. The passage also discusses being one's own companion. This is a Stoic philosophical argument with a religious account of the world, not a contemporary theory of social support. Its original context remains and applicability is limited.

Especially avoid transferring the author's sharp remark about the body facing murder into contemporary advice. It belongs to Stoicism's distinction between the person and externals but cancels no physical danger for the reader. This article suggests neither remaining without help under threat nor declaring fear deficient wisdom. Safety and needed support require realistic consideration even when philosophy permits thinking differently about experience.

The useful intersection is more modest: any person's presence need not end burdensome separateness. In a hypothetical scene, a crowd of strangers supplies noise and numbers without a trusted contact. Wanting to leave the room may then seek the right person rather than more people around. The opposite is possible too: people are nearby with whom much conversation is unnecessary. Quantity and quality of participation do not automatically match.

Doing something alone also does not prove help unnecessary. Reading, cooking, or reflecting can coexist with depending on others' actual participation in important matters. Independence is not complete provision through one's own powers. Our application imposes no Stoic ideal as a mandatory standard. It simply allows separate activity without finding every need for another an exposure of inadequacy.

A philosophical text can be a conversational partner without judging mood. A difficult evening is no examination Epictetus requires you to pass. The author has his normative system; a contemporary person has specific circumstances and limits. Difference protects both: the source remains a source, and the reader can decline the proposed fullness of self-sufficiency and seek available human support.

V. Silence can contain activity or absence

What happens in chosen solitude? Sometimes someone reads, writes, listens, or makes something by hand. Sometimes they simply stop answering demands. Sometimes space appears in which nothing is needed yet. Every option is a legitimate description without needing equal pleasantness. A pause requires no useful content to justify it. A specific activity can nevertheless reveal what was wanted from the time.

Imagine staying home for a book. After several pages, reading is unwanted. Choose something else or stop. Do not automatically conclude solitude failed because its planned program was

uncompleted. Perhaps an absence of obligations was desired. That answer cannot be assigned beforehand either: burdensome emptiness should remain acknowledged rather than renamed secret rest for an attractive story's sake.

In another case, someone stays alone awaiting a message. Externally the evening is spent at home, but attention concerns a missing reply. Calling this chosen solitude needs qualification: choosing the place does not mean wanting the whole situation. The room can be preferred while a meeting is awaited. Clarifying desire's layer avoids a false dilemma requiring total enjoyment of silence or immediate departure.

Meaningful content is not measured by productivity either. A written page proves no good feeling; an absent result proves no wasted time. Participation can be considered separately from a report. Was desired space available, is suitable contact possible, what was postponed, which wish changed? These questions preserve the reality of chosen time without demanding a finished product as proof of its right to exist.

If nothing is wanted, the article explains this with no single word and offers no diagnosis. Circumstances can vary; the answer may remain unknown. Avoid forcing a role of someone excellent at being alone. Describing the actual evening and needed participation helps more than adding an obligatory image of successful solitude. Available silence creates no duty to fill it with meaning.

VI. A time limit matters more than permanent self-sufficiency

Wanting solitude often has scale. An hour after conversation, an evening without meeting, several working days. This need not declare one's whole future life. A locally expressed need allows considering conditions and consequences. “I want a pause now” differs from “Nobody is needed anymore.” The first leaves connection and change open; the second makes a broad conclusion unsupported by one evening.

Imagine wanting a day without visitors after a full event. The following day brings interest in conversation. Change does not contradict the initial wish. Solitude should become no identity requiring defence. Different forms can be preferred at different moments. We set no ideal hourly balance: it depends on person, task, support, and actual conditions rather than a universal norm from an essay.

A time boundary also helps joint expectations. If you describe a pause, a friend may understand whether a later message is expected or you cannot answer now. Avoid promises you do not know how to fulfil. Indicate uncertainty and revisit an agreement later. Clarity distinguishes a limited break from final refusal, although it guarantees no absence of another's disappointment.

Sometimes solitude continues even though this is not what the person wants. Illness, living conditions, schedules, and distance can limit contact. A command to find balance cannot repair them. This article investigates no complete list or reader's cause. Material limits must nevertheless remain in the story so a chosen pause is not the only term describing lasting unwanted lack of participation.

Time can be assessed without a strict counter. Does desire change, is revision available, do necessary connections and tasks remain? This invites clarification, not obligatory socialising's timetable. Solitude gains no indefinite status from once being useful or pleasant. Loneliness gains no eternal status from a difficult evening either; new information and decisions remain possible.

VII. Privacy requires no proof of usefulness

A right to withhold a pause's content differs from an obligation to be unavailable. Personal space can be chosen while necessary matters are agreed. Detailed explanation of solitary activity is unnecessary to deserve time. Privacy is not secret rejection; actual conditions and boundaries can be discussed without presenting one's entire inner life for inspection.

Imagine an acquaintance demands a report: if you declined the meeting, what was so important? Perhaps something serious, perhaps nothing special. An absent remarkable result does not automatically make refusal dishonest. You can say separate time was wanted. A broken agreement's consequences, however, need consideration. Privacy is no universal escape from responsibility for actual actions affecting others.

Opposite pressure exists too: always explain to preserve closeness. Not every pause must end in confession. Sometimes thought needs time before an answer exists. Immediately presenting content can turn solitude into preparation for a report. The article preserves an intermediate unknown. Loved people can know the question is open without receiving everything before you are ready to share.

Silence can nevertheless create actual uncertainty for another. If an important joint decision depends on your answer, seek a manageable agreement. “I don't know yet; let's return tomorrow” can be more precise than disappearing if the promise is possible. We offer no universal sentence. Personal content differs from information necessary for joint action affecting two separate lives.

Privacy therefore needs no proof of solitude's benefit. It can accompany ordinary rest, reflection, or absent ready meaning. Shared obligations are not automatically cancelled either. Both limits preserve space without attractive justification and connection without total transparency. Choosing only one is unnecessary where a particular situation allows limited participation and personal time to be agreed.

VIII. Bad treatment does not become spiritual solitude

“Solitude” sometimes lends dignity to exclusion, removal of needed help, or controlled contacts. A label should not conceal actions. If a door is closed from outside and alternatives forbidden, being alone does not mean free choice. Retain actual limits and consequences. The philosophical beauty of a separate life provides no grounds to declare deprived support a useful ordeal.

Imagine someone forbidden contact with friends in the name of needed silence and care. Consider who imposes the rule, whether refusal is possible, and what disagreement brings. One remark gives no relational diagnosis. Yet prohibition and revision's availability are facts no story of spiritual independence can replace. Under threat, safety matters more than proving a calm ability to remain alone.

A less dramatic scene exists: you are not invited and call the evening a deliberate pause to avoid disappointment. The description is possible but cannot automatically be called a lie. Perhaps absent invitation and wanted silence coexist. Keep both layers. Solitude need not be pure choice free of disappointment, nor disappointment destroy everything suitable in the remaining evening.

Naming the unwanted layer does not relinquish dignity. Someone can say contact was lacking without immediately restoring it as an obligation. Nor must every exclusion prove personal insignificance. Information about the situation is needed rather than a final verdict. This preserves further decision and current experience's right to be neither attractive, self-sufficient, nor finished.

If the condition remains burdensome or safe support unavailable, reflection alone may be insufficient. NHS allows seeking help when coping with loneliness is difficult. Choose local services according to actual conditions; British contacts are not promised internationally. The article prescribes no treatment or prior self-sufficiency before asking a person or appropriate professional to participate.

IX. Returning to people can choose a form

Ending solitude need not restore the former flow of communication. Choose a short meeting, joint activity, calm conversation, presence without a detailed story. These guarantee no closeness but clarify what is wanted now. If a particular person is needed, general noise need not substitute. If simple company is needed, profound conversation need not be the only worthy form.

Imagine wanting a walk with a friend and small talk after an evening at home. No obligation exists to explain solitude's internal conclusions. The meeting can be ordinary. If the other

wants a serious topic, forms need agreement. Each retains a separate wish. Returning to connection requires no dissolution of personal space previously needed and perhaps needed again later.

Contact is sometimes impossible today. Acknowledge desire and actual limitation without commanding the need away. The article offers no universal human substitute. A book or walk can have its value without satisfying every request for closeness. It is no failure that a pleasant activity left longing. Different participation can coexist with a lack needing another response or remaining open for now.

Examining the new form concerns the observable rather than ideal feeling. Was agreement possible, was respect present, did conversation fit the desired pace, is further clarification possible? Loneliness disappearing is no mandatory result. The other need not become an instrument proving the pause correctly spent. Actual meetings have conditions and unknowns; good intention secures no predetermined inner effect.

Returning also preserves a right to the next break. Being with people and separate time should not refute each other. Consider their arrangement in an actual life: what is available, agreed, or missing? We create no ideal person always balancing effortlessly. Preserve the ability to notice change and choose a form with new information.

X. One evening can have several truthful descriptions

Return to the same room. In one account you chose silence; in another you lost a meeting's opportunity. Perhaps both are partially true today. One label for the whole evening is unnecessary. Manageable distinction includes initial desire, actual circumstances, changed experience, and available options. It need not prove being alone always wonderful or always dangerous to closeness.

Wanted solitude retains revision's right. Burdensome loneliness retains support's right. Neither establishes a personality type or ends a person's story. Numbers present supply no sufficient answer; personal choice cancels no material limits; philosophical ideals replace no person needed for a specific issue. These boundaries leave room for living description rather than a predetermined status.

Perhaps demands of conversation rather than people needed removal. Perhaps a particular contact was missing. Perhaps silence is wanted today and a meeting expected tomorrow. Each answer affects the next decision. This article does not know it beforehand. Its task is to keep different requests distinct without punishing change that experience made available.

A difficult evening needs no certificate of spiritual independence. A calm one needs no added anxiety merely because people are absent. Nor must a chosen pause produce new meaning as

proof. Actual aloneness can remain an ordinary part of a day. You can name it in your words, including pleasantness, boredom, longing, or the unknown without one prescribed emotional report.

Good solitude need not become permanent absence of others. Wanting connection need not become continuous availability. Between those extreme demands is a specific evening, a separate decision, and a next question. What is needed now, what is actually available, and how is revision's right preserved? An answer can be modest while distinguishing chosen space from a lack no attractive label can order away.

What this means in practice

If the distinction fits, choose one manageable evening or pause. Describe the external circumstance: where you were, who was present, which contact was available. Separately name the initial wish. Your whole social life or character needs no assessment. The practice is voluntary and replaces no necessary support; stop if considering the episode becomes too difficult.

Look at change over time. Was something else wanted an hour later? Was revision possible? Was formally available contact suitable and safe or merely technically possible? Fully free choice need not be proved. Acknowledge the wanted part beside limits. Several truthful descriptions are no error needing removal for an attractive story.

Clarify one current request: fewer conversations, a particular listener, quiet company, private activity, or unknown for now. A possible decision need not involve going to people. If it affects joint work, agree needed information while preserving other privacy. If connection is unavailable, do not command yourself to stop wanting it; acknowledging a limit can be an observable outcome too.

If choosing a small step, define it without promising feeling. A message, agreement about a pause, changed meeting form, or withholding a subject. Observe what happened and which information appeared. The other retains an answer and their own availability; you retain disappointment, revision, and another support. This is no self-sufficiency examination or guarantee of loneliness disappearing.

Retain the possibility of declining the exercise. Being alone needs no mastery as an obligatory admission skill for relationships. Needing another requires no defeat to meet a philosophical ideal. The practice is limited to one distinction: what in your time was chosen space, what a lack, and what has no clear name yet and can remain open.

Key quotation

> *"...to be his own companion."*

Epictetus, *Discourses*, III, 13; George Long, *A Selection from the Discourses of Epictetus with the Encheiridion*, Gutenberg no. 10661; a short original fragment. The Stoic ideal does not cancel actual help and physical safety a contemporary person needs.

Connections between traditions

Comparison	Intersection and boundary
CDC ↔ chosen pause	Absent contacts and felt lack differ; solitude as choice is an editorial concept, not CDC diagnosis.
Epictetus III, 13 ↔ trusted help	A crowd does not replace a suitable person; Stoicism gives no right to discount threat or needed support.
Mark 6 ↔ pause from the flow	Withdrawal can be shared, reducing demands; the religious scene is no clinical prescription.
Epictetus ↔ activity alone	Being one's own companion differs from complete practical self-sufficiency.
NHS ↔ the essay's limit	Other help is possible when coping is difficult; a British page provides no local services for every reader.

Sources

• Epictetus, *A Selection from the Discourses...*, III, 13, George Long, Gutenberg no. 10661. The complete solitary-man section and metadata were read. Stoic argument's boundary remains; the sharp remark about the body facing murder is not used as advice.

• Mark 6:30–32, King James Version, 1611. The whole passage was read; shared respite is no universal solitude program.

• CDC, *Health Effects of Social Isolation and Loneliness*, 15 May 2024. The substantive page was read; only definitions are used without individual risk prediction.

• NHS, *Feeling lonely*, reviewed 22 July 2026. The substantive page was read; limited support for seeking suitable help is used.

Tags

solitude, loneliness, pause, choice, silence, closeness, help, contacts, privacy, separateness, revision, time, desire, conditions, safety, trust, presence, demands, obligations, independence, boundaries, unknown, support, communication form, voluntary participation, Epictetus, Mark, CDC, NHS, space

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