

UNITED WISDOM

Camus: absurdity and continuing life

Meaning and Direction

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

P-01-N01 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Camus: absurdity and continuing life

Epigraph

> *One must imagine Sisyphus happy.*

Albert Camus, Le mythe de Sisyphe. United Wisdom’s own English translation of the French phrase checked on Gallimard’s page. Text.

What this article is about

What can be done with the question of life when the world provides no final answer of the kind expected? Camus connects this tension with absurdity. A short formula, however, easily becomes an everyday command to endure all repetition, expect no help and feel happy. This article separates the philosophical question from those substitutions. It briefly identifies The Myth of Sisyphus through a checked publisher presentation, then offers our own editorial discussion using a shared garden. Repetition, demands, changeable conditions and an open question remain distinct. Comparisons with Stoic and religious texts preserve different grounds. This article replaces neither a complete reading of Camus nor appropriate help; it is no programme for changing a state. It gives concrete participation a human scale without requiring final justification of an entire life.

I. Absurd does not mean every disappointment

In everyday speech, absurd may describe a foolish rule, an unreasonable argument or work that must be done again tomorrow. Camus’s philosophical question is both wider and more precise. It concerns the relation between a human demand for intelligibility and a world that does not provide an expected final answer. A foolish schedule can be changed; the ultimate ground of life may not have the same form of solution. Confusing the levels makes an everyday error represent all existence, or turns philosophy into a reason to correct nothing. We first distinguish the levels, then discuss our own editorial implications for continued participation. These are neither a complete account of Camus nor a tested way to change a reader’s state.

Imagine someone caring for a small shared garden. A path is cleared and rain brings leaves again. A plant is trimmed and grows back. Repetition once seemed ordinary; now it prompts a question about why no final completion arrives. This hypothetical scene is not psychological research. It contains a practical question about demands and another about why a finite action should provide final confirmation of life. The first needs information about time, help and conditions. The second does not vanish when a tool changes. One person may ask both, but

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

the answers need not be identical. Clearing a path proves no philosophy, while an open philosophical question does not remove the possibility of discussing duties.

A repeated action is not by itself Sisyphus's punishment. A garden may have users, changeable conditions and a chosen form of participation. Calling all repetition a mythical curse erases these differences. Calling every repetition a source of joy erases others: coercion, excessive demands and absent consent. The image therefore needs care. It opens a question about relating to incompletion without establishing facts about a particular job. Readers need not assume a heroic role because they are tired. Ordinary words can name events first. It may be a dull task, an unfair allocation of duties, or a larger question to which an everyday event merely gave an audible form.

II. Continuing does not require a pretended final answer

Gallimard's description of The Myth of Sisyphus places the gap between a human wish to understand and the world's silence alongside the question of continuing to live. Its response involves lucidity, revolt, freedom and a passion for life without a supernatural guarantee. This is the book's philosophical framework, not a clinical model or instructions for a crisis. The short epigraph was checked in the publisher's French text; both language versions below are our own translations. Several lines are not claimed to replace reading the entire essay.

From this brief ground begins our editorial question: must final certainty precede presence in a concrete life? In the garden, someone may lack an answer about the universe while seeing leaves, another participant, available time and today's agreement. Those facts do not become metaphysical proof, but lack of such proof does not make them unreal. Action can have a stated limited ground: the path will be used today. Refusal can have another: demands have become unmanageable. Neither decision needs to pretend the larger question is closed. Honesty here concerns an answer's scale rather than a duty immediately to acquire the correct feeling.

Continuing need not require inventing a guarantee persuasive only in a ceremonial moment. Work can be described as help for particular people without promising permanent freedom from doubt. A harvest can be anticipated without proving a final world order. A conversation can matter without making its partner answer every question. Such limits are not necessarily poorer than a grand promise; they correspond more precisely to what the action can provide. This is our interpretation for an everyday scene, not a concealed Camus quotation. Disagreement remains possible: readers may hold religious grounds or another philosophy. Their beliefs should be considered in their own substance, not cancelled for our example's convenience.

III. Lucidity differs from a harsh command to oneself

Lucidity can easily become a new command to be strong: once you see no ready answer, stop complaining. That demand does not follow from our scene. Recognising limits of knowledge differs from forbidding fatigue. Recognising repetition differs from calling every complaint unworthy. If actual demands disappear for the sake of a lucid hero’s image, description becomes illusion again, merely a stricter one. The gardener may have a sore back, insufficient time or another important plan. These circumstances deserve appropriate consideration. Philosophical vocabulary must not make them concealed, as though body and time obstruct worthy continuation instead of belonging to the world in which participation occurs.

At a practical scale, lucidity may begin with an ordinary statement: I can clear one path today, not the entire site. Or: I need to know who will help next month. Or: this task no longer matches our agreement. None proves heroism or establishes eternal certainty. Each makes relations with conditions more definite. Refusal need not be explained through absurdity; its actual ground can suffice. Agreement need not invoke the universe’s meaning; benefit and limits can be named. A person retains the right to a complex philosophical question without inserting it into every working remark. Language then restores the action’s own scale instead of requiring a ready-made role.

Lucidity is also not certainty that understanding is complete. The gardener may know today’s workload and not another participant’s intentions. Repetition may be visible without knowing how it will be evaluated in a year. A conviction may be held while its partner does not share it. Acknowledging the unknown does not automatically weaken thought. It prevents a missing piece of knowledge being replaced by an attractive or sombre story. An honest response sometimes has several parts: I see this, suppose this, and wish to ask this. The form guarantees no successful conversation. It also does not require the entire world to be understood merely because one concrete action is needed today.

IV. Continuing life does not mean preserving every condition

A dangerous everyday substitution turns continuation into agreement to endure the former arrangement. If Sisyphus pushes the stone, a person supposedly must endlessly perform whatever was imposed. Yet a mythical image is no employment contract, family rule or prohibition on changing a situation. Some actual conditions are changeable. Duties can be discussed, another tool sought, a role left or help requested. Particular options depend on facts and possibilities. Freedom from every limitation is not promised. The image should not remove available action before it has been considered. Participation in life can also be preserved by refusing one form of participation whose grounds are no longer acceptable.

In our scene the gardener first assumed responsibility for everything. It then emerged that others did not even know the workload. This is a possible turn in a hypothetical story, not a typical psychological scenario. Conversation may produce a new schedule or nothing. Even an unsuccessful reply changes the question’s content: the issue now concerns not only repetition but absent agreed help. It need not become the eternal arrangement of the universe. An actual question has recipients and limits. They can be discussed without philosophical victory being required. Absurdity has not thereby vanished; the practical issue simply receives consideration of its own instead of proving every exit impossible in advance.

Not every limit can be changed now, and a formula cannot cancel that fact. Someone may remain in a role for material reasons or commitments. Compulsion should not then be presented as freely chosen admiration. It is possible to say: I continue under these conditions for now, although they do not suit me. Both parts stay visible. Available help is considered in its own substance; an unknown option is not replaced by advice merely to want one. A philosophical text cannot create resources, rights or a safe opportunity for the reader. A useful boundary is refusing to make unavailable options a personal fault, or a dignified image proof that actual change is unnecessary.

V. The future can remain open without a guarantee

Rejecting a final guarantee is sometimes read as forbidding every expectation. A person supposedly cannot look forward to a friend’s help, another day or a good harvest without betraying lucidity. In our editorial distinction, expecting a concrete event differs in scale from promising final justification for an entire life. A meeting can be arranged without claiming it resolves existence. Work can be planned without making the plan a proven destiny. An event’s likelihood needs grounds of its own; a philosophical image makes it neither zero nor certain. This article establishes no single meaning of hope for every tradition read. It asks that a broad thesis not quietly cancel an ordinary limited expectation.

The gardener can plant without knowing whether the plant will take. The decision rests on information about the site, time and available care, not a promise that the universe rewards worthy people. If it fails, causes and a further choice can be considered. Failure need not prove personal worthlessness or the meaninglessness of all care. Nor must every outcome be called good to preserve participation. A loss can be recognised as a loss. This is an example of relating to a limited activity, neither gardening instructions nor a tested way to experience disappointment. Its point is precision: an open future leaves room for emerging facts and a decision revisable in their light.

This does not settle Camus’s metaphysical question for the reader. Some see concrete expectations within broader religious trust; others see ordinary engagement with uncertainty. The grounds may differ. A shared vocabulary need not be invented to make differences

disappear. In the practical scene, watering times can be agreed despite different accounts of life’s ultimate value. Agreement on action proves no agreement about the world. Disagreement about the world need not exclude every joint action. Concrete relationships remain between those statements, requiring clear terms, consent and possible refusal. No philosophy should automatically speak for another person about why they came to the garden today.

VI. Presence is not a report of the correct mood

The phrase about a happy Sisyphus can easily become a demand to smile under every load. Yet the epigraph is a philosophical image, not a measurement of a particular person’s state. A reader may feel no happiness while participating, or feel joy while still questioning meaning. Requiring the correct mood as proof of understanding Camus turns a text into a social examination. That is not required here. The image permits asking how continuation relates to lucidity and one’s own stance; it gives others no right to determine an acceptable facial expression. This concerns limits on applying the quotation, not its sole possible philosophical interpretation for every reader.

Presence in the garden can be simple: noticing cold soil, a need to stop, a neighbour’s conversation and an unfinished path. This describes an available scene, not a claim that attention has therapeutic effects. Details need not immediately become gratitude; they may please or irritate. A concrete world is encountered instead of only checking whether it has proved its overall value. One working hour can have its own extent without settling the question forever. It needs no ceremonial name. It can remain ordinary participation, chosen, limited or later rejected. Its reality does not depend on producing a persuasive story of inner transformation.

Continuing does not require the previous pace. Participation may shrink, another task be chosen, or rest taken. In our example a changed form neither removes life nor proves victory over absurdity. It concerns the available arrangement of a day. No correct form can be prescribed for an unknown reader. An unchanging workload should not become a criterion of worth. A philosophical image can support proportionate thought; when it starts speaking in place of actual conditions and feelings, its application deserves a pause and clarification. People retain the right not to recognise themselves in Sisyphus. This makes them neither less capable of serious questions nor less deserving of ordinary contact with another person.

VII. A similar practical question does not merge different grounds

The opening of the Enchiridion, in an electronic text credited to Elizabeth Carter, distinguishes one’s own actions from what is not subject to oneself. This Stoic frame is not Camus in different words. Ecclesiastes chapter3 in KJV places human limits and enjoyment of labour within God’s gift. Its religious ground must not quietly become absurdity’s vocabulary either. The references compare a question about limited action while retaining disagreement about the world. Specific passages of the ancient texts are used, not complete expositions of traditions or proof of a doctrine they all share.

Garden participants may perform one action for different reasons: a duty before God, an exercise in worthy conduct, or chosen care without a final answer. Their grounds need not be declared identical before a path is discussed. Every worldview need not be accepted as true to hear the reasons named. Cooperation’s conditions belong to a particular meeting: the agreed extent, who may change an arrangement and where participation ends. Clarity neither cancels the wider dispute nor makes it unimportant. It avoids demanding philosophical unity as the price of every joint activity, while preserving each person’s ability to name their ground and decline another’s.

Freedom, acceptance, gift and revolt also need care in comparison. They do not become synonyms because a common image of limitation appeals to the reader. One frame gives the world’s order a religious ground; another emphasises a particular discipline of stance; another discusses an expected guarantee that is absent. This article chooses no final ground for the reader and turns no text wholesale into psychological advice. Its own editorial question is narrower: how can one action avoid being required to provide an answer beyond its capacity, while a real decision remains possible? Sources illuminate adjacent aspects. Their differences belong to reading rather than obstructing an attractive table. Comparison therefore requires limits as well as shared words.

VIII. Philosophical thought has a boundary of help

Camus’s book poses an ultimate philosophical question; actual safety questions need not therefore be addressed through philosophy alone. Immediate danger or a need for professional support does not lose its appropriate help because a final answer about life is absent. This is a boundary of the article’s genre, not a reader diagnosis. Ordinary interest in Camus does not establish a crisis either. A book title cannot reveal someone’s state, and an elegant phrase cannot provide help it lacks. There are no dangerous instructions, judgements of anyone’s life or demands to prove a right to continue here. Philosophical victory is not a prerequisite for asking another person for concrete support.

In a less extreme situation, a friend need not carry the final answer either. They can help discuss a schedule, share a task or hear a question without debating it. The gardener can request a practical conversation about demands rather than an explanation of the world's meaning. A friend can state honestly which help is available. This contact is no validated method of overcoming absurdity; it has its own content and limits. Sometimes no answer or disagreement follows. Actual relationships need not obey a philosophical article's composition. They cannot therefore be excluded beforehand because the large question remains open. A specific offer or refusal deserves consideration through its own words rather than as a symbol of ultimate victory or defeat.

Reading itself can be bounded by one's question. A difficult book may be put aside, revisited or disputed at its grounds. Complete lucidity need not precede using a short distinction, but a distinction is not mastery of the whole work. This respects both source and reader. The source does not become a collection of slogans, nor the reader an object to be brought to a predetermined conclusion. In our scene, noticing that repeated tasks, absent worldview guarantees and changeable conditions belong to different levels may suffice. Further reading can develop or challenge the thought. This article does not close inquiry with its final sentence or promise the same result for everyone.

IX. Continuing can have a human scale

Continuing in our hypothetical garden means deciding which participation is actually offered now, rather than obtaining a permanently clear answer. Someone may clear a path, discuss help and acknowledge remaining questions about the world. A role can change or this particular activity end. Such a choice proves no acceptance of Camus and removes none of his philosophical question. It belongs to living at a limited scale. Today's hour need not become victory over all incompletion. Yet incompletion need not remove the hour's reality. Both positions can remain without a ceremonial conclusion that life became intelligible. Sometimes it is enough to stop requiring final justification from a small act while leaving room for one's own decision.

Joy, irritation and doubt remain at this scale. They need not be sorted into signs of a correct reader. Someone can dislike repetition, value the garden, challenge the workload and lack a general answer simultaneously. That account is more complex than a slogan but more faithful to the scene. Its parts can change separately: conditions ease while conviction remains open; mood improves while objection remains; participation ends without relationships disappearing. No turn establishes a universal law. It shows why a whole life need not be a daily report on one philosophical formula. Concrete content deserves attention without a prior demand to prove every part finally consistent.

The epigraph can invite serious reading without commanding happiness. Camus’s question remains continuation in the face of an absent final answer. This article adds its own caution about application: do not confuse it with every everyday failure, cancel available change, or replace help with a philosophical phrase. Differences between traditions remain. A reader may agree with one observation and reject another. That is room for answering for one’s understanding, not failed reading. The garden remains a garden, an unfinished path a limited task, and the larger question a larger question. Thought and participation can continue between them without making either the unknown or today’s action the final resolution of all existence.

What this means in practice

Choose one repeated task you are tempted to call Sisyphean. This editorial exercise is no therapeutic procedure or test of mastery of Camus’s philosophy. First describe the task literally: what repeats, who proposed it, which conditions were agreed and what information is missing. Record the larger question separately, if present: why a limited action provides no final answer about life. The two records need not coincide.

Name one condition that can be discussed or clarified: extent, time, help, a tool or a possible changed role. Also name a limit not subject to today’s decision. Complete control is not required. For a specialised condition, obtain appropriate information rather than substituting a philosophical metaphor. Then ask whether the action has a limited ground you presently accept. Yes, no and unknown are all possible answers.

A small form of participation, refusal or clarification may be chosen. It need not produce happiness, remove absurdity or prove strength. No correct mood need be reported to others. If safety or professional support is needed, that request has its own place. A possible outcome is distinguishing an open question from a concrete task while retaining your own response and available changes in conditions.

Key quotation

> *Some things are in our control and others not.*

Epictetus, Enchiridion1. Displayed Internet Classics Archive English version credited to Elizabeth Carter; print wording not independently collated. Text.

Connections between traditions

Comparison does not establish one teaching.

Question	Adjacent frames	Boundary
Final answer	Camus; editorial scene	The garden proves no philosophy.
Limited action	Epictetus; practical choice	Stoicism is not Camus’s absurdity.
Labour and joy	Ecclesiastes; repetition	Gift retains its religious ground.
Continuation and conditions	Three contexts; demands	An image does not prohibit actual change.
Thought and help	Philosophy; exercise	Prose does not replace appropriate support.

Primary sources

1. Camus, Le mythe de Sisyphe: Gallimard. Checked publisher presentation and short French phrase; both quotation versions are original United Wisdom translations.

2. Epictetus, Enchiridion1. Electronic version credited to Elizabeth Carter; key quotation checked against displayed text, not collated with a print edition.

3. Ecclesiastes3, KJV. Read chapter on human limits and gift; brief paraphrase.

Actual reading scopes and edition limits appear in research notes. Garden, application discussion and exercise are original editorial work.

Tags

Camus, absurdity, Sisyphus, continuation, life, lucidity, revolt, freedom, repetition, incompletion, question, grounds, guarantee, participation, action, conditions, help, boundaries, happiness, expectation, future, garden, responsibility, philosophy, religion, Epictetus, Ecclesiastes, Stoicism, autonomy, understanding

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.