

UNITED WISDOM

Existential Solitude and the Possibility of Intimacy

Meaning and Direction

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

P-04-N01 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Existential Solitude and the Possibility of Intimacy

Epigraph

> *“Two are better than one; because they have a good reward for their labour.” — Ecclesiastes4:9, King James Version.*

What this article is about

Another person can listen attentively, help, and remain beside us, but cannot live our experience in our place. An overly broad conclusion can follow: if complete coincidence is impossible, intimacy must always be an illusion. This article considers what actual relationships are possible between people whose experience does not become identical. Existential solitude here means the personal non-transferability of experience, not a diagnosis, measured psychological category, or proof of universal incomprehension. It differs from absent contact, unwanted disconnection, and chosen time alone. Seneca's Stoic discussion, Aristotle's account of friendship, and biblical mutual assistance retain different foundations. They establish no therapeutic effect for an exercise. Original distinctions clarify what we expect from another: recognition, presence, particular help, or complete removal of difference. Closeness can be considered without requiring sameness or accepting every kind of treatment simply because perfect understanding is unavailable.

I. Another cannot live our experience in our place

Imagine someone moving to another city for the first time. A close friend knows the plans, helps pack, and listens to an account of the new room. Yet the evening in an unfamiliar place is experienced by the person who moved. The friend need not feel precisely the same sensations simultaneously for participation to be real. This hypothetical example distinguishes someone's own experience from a relationship with the person experiencing it. It proves neither that experience cannot be communicated nor that nobody ever understands another. Communication, response, and assistance have their own objects. They can differ from an immediate feeling while addressing it accurately enough that conversation is neither empty nor doomed beforehand.

The question becomes harder when understanding is expected to remove solitude completely. Every insufficiently precise response can then seem proof that connection is impossible. The expectation itself needs naming. Must the friend know the facts, recognize the change's

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

importance, support a specific action, or feel everything identically? These demands cannot be treated as one. Partial understanding does not make every response acceptable. A missing subject can be identified and clarification requested. Retaining personal experience requires no abandonment of conversational accuracy; it helps avoid making accuracy an impossible demand that another lose their own position and become a second bearer of exactly the same experience, without difference between people.

II. Different meanings of solitude and loneliness

“I am alone” can describe an empty room, a missing desired conversation, chosen time alone, or limits on transferring personal experience. These circumstances can overlap without sharing one meaning. Someone among acquaintances receives no needed response; another spends an evening without company and welcomes it; a third feels supported while recognizing that a decision or experience remains their own. These are ordinary distinctions of meaning rather than a clinical classification. One phrase establishes neither health status nor the cause of a feeling. Greater conversational precision begins by identifying the subject someone is naming, what is actually known about the situation, and what remains an assumption.

Different subjects also change a possible response. Missing information calls for obtaining it rather than debating human solitude generally. A wish for conversation is not answered by a philosophical phrase about independence instead of contact with an accessible person. When time alone is wanted, imposed company may fail that wish. When the question concerns experience's personal boundary, another message need not remove it. No universal helping procedure follows. The narrower step is to avoid answering one question as though another were asked. Someone may clarify a request and change it after conversation. Neither an infallible label nor proof that a difficulty belongs to the correct philosophical category is required immediately.

III. Understanding is not simply complete or absent

A friend may understand a circumstance correctly while misjudging its meaning for us. He remembers the move's date but treats the room's convenience as central, while the person wants to discuss leaving a familiar place. Such a mistake need not become final proof of indifference. Gratitude for a response also requires no pretense that the subject was understood. In our conversation, the currently important part can be named. This requests a direction of attention rather than a correct emotion. The friend can respond, clarify, or acknowledge incomplete understanding. Admitting uncertainty may be more honest than confidently explaining someone through a personal story resembling only an outward circumstance.

A similar experience can begin conversation without granting advance knowledge of everything about another. If the friend has also moved, memory helps offer a question rather than replace an answer. Place, relationships, expectations, and accessible conditions may differ. Yet a listener cannot be required to avoid every reference to personal experience: conversation includes their participation. What matters is room for correction. Can someone say the comparison does not fit? Is understanding checked through particular words rather than a confident tone? Closeness here consists not in infallible reading of an inner world but in clarifying the actual subject while preserving attention to each other and each person's right not to be completely known in advance.

Misunderstanding is especially easy when a reply is short and its conditions unknown. “I see” may mean the listener heard a fact, cannot continue now, or considers an explanation sufficient. None can be chosen on their behalf without grounds. If clarification is accessible, the subject can be asked about rather than proof of affection demanded: which part of my account is clear now? Such a question guarantees no attentive response and need not be asked every time. It distinguishes checking understanding from extracting a final verdict on a relationship from one word. Leaving uncertainty unknown can be more accurate than treating a brief message as complete knowledge of someone's inner life and the connection's entire history.

IV. Seneca's self-sufficiency retains friends

In Letter IX, Seneca distinguishes a sage's ability to do without friends from a wish to do without them. Friendship and participation in human society remain desired. This is a normative Stoic ideal, not an account of how everyone must experience loss. It cannot require absence of grief, swift replacement of a friend, or proof of well-being through rejecting help. The relevant narrow boundary is that one's own grounding need not make relationships unnecessary dependence. Yet the Stoic grounding of the supreme good differs from contemporary discussion of accessible support. The text diagnoses no condition, explains no reader's loneliness, and promises no immediate creation of new intimacy.

In our hypothetical move, someone can retain their own decision while wanting conversation. Asking for presence proves no loss of independence. It also does not make another an obligatory source of the correct state. The friend has conditions of participation. If conversation is currently impossible, actual unavailability needs distinction from a general verdict that relationships are unnecessary. Independence can mean honest acceptance of one's part in action rather than a prohibition on wanting a response. This is an original contemporary distinction beside the source, not a universal definition of Stoicism. No resemblance to an impeccable sage is required for a request to remain permissible or one's relationship to experience to deserve serious attention.

V. Shared life involves activity

In Book IX of the Nicomachean Ethics, Aristotle asks whether a happy person needs friends. His answer retains shared activity, discussion, and thought; friendship exceeds receiving assistance in adversity. This is normative reasoning about a good life and virtuous friends, not research into contact's health effects. The relevant possibility is to see a relationship through actual participation. Two people can talk, work on an accessible undertaking, or share joy without experiencing everything identically. Shared life occurs through what they do and communicate, not solely a claim of complete coincidence. Historical limits of Aristotle's social picture are not adopted as ready-made rules for contemporary relationships or judgments of people.

Suppose a friend helps arrange books after the move. One chooses a shelf's position, the other checks the order and asks which volumes should remain within reach. Neither knows everything about the other's feelings, but an actual shared action occurs. This proves no necessary elimination of loneliness through practical help. Assistance has its own subject and may be welcome in precisely this form. If conversation matters more now, action should not replace a heard request. Yet absent confessional discussion does not make every contribution superficial. Different forms of closeness need different responses; their actual accessibility and acceptance matter more than rating all of them by one scale of personal disclosure.

Shared life is possible outside difficulty too. Someone can show a friend a well-arranged room, discuss a book, or propose walking along a familiar street together. A listener need not feel identical joy to take interest and participate. Requiring every response to reproduce one's enthusiasm makes another living reaction seem deficient. Yet actual difference permits hearing something unnoticed by oneself. The friend may welcome the meeting more than the new shelf, while arranging the space matters to its owner. These subjects need not exclude each other. Closeness exceeds helping a person in need: it can include voluntary participation in ordinary life, where nobody must prove indispensability by rescuing someone else.

VI. Help can be requested without handing oneself over

Ecclesiastes4:7–12 contrasts isolated toil with advantages of mutual assistance. Lifting someone who falls and standing together concern specific actions. The passage belongs to biblical wisdom; it guarantees neither every alliance's safety nor a compulsory partner for everyone. Here it helps show that retaining personal experience does not make assistance meaningless. A friend cannot live our evening but can perform an accessible action. A request becomes clearer when its subject is named: listen to an account, help with a task, or check information. Each action need not completely transform an inner state for its reality and possible value to a participant to be acknowledged.

A clear request nevertheless ensures no positive answer. A listener may lack time, resources, or competence. Declining a particular contribution should be considered through known conditions, without automatically assuming absent care or hidden agreement. Accepted help likewise retains boundaries. Someone does not hand over an entire life to a person who helped with one task, or become obliged to reveal everything personal in exchange. Gratitude is not unlimited access. These distinctions preserve rather than devalue reciprocity by keeping action's subject and participants' independence present. The question is what response was actually given and agreed, rather than whether two people have finally been proved completely inseparable.

VII. Openness need not be total

Wanting to be understood can bring a thought that everything must be told at once. Disclosure's volume alone establishes neither intimacy nor accurate understanding. Someone can choose a subject, listener, and accessible conversational form. A part of experience may not yet be ready for discussion. This boundary proves no distrust of everyone and makes no later conversation false. Another person can likewise identify what they can hear now and what exceeds their participation. This article supplies no clinical disclosure or therapy rules. It concerns ordinary voluntary communication, where both people's consent remains relevant even when the wish to be heard is strong.

In a conversation about moving, one important question can be named without recounting an entire relationship history or life. Perhaps the new room does not yet feel like one's own place. A listener needs no complete archive of experience to ask about that particular subject. The speaker also need not guess the sole correct formulation. If words are unavailable, this can be acknowledged with a request to stay in conversation without a ready explanation. A request remains a request rather than an order to be silent correctly. Clarifying both participants' limits keeps communication concrete without making complete disclosure payment for another's attention and presence.

VIII. Personal space and shared consequences

A right to personal non-transferability does not make every shared condition concealable as “private.” If moving changes an agreed contribution, another needs the factual change communicated. They gain no right to every feeling but retain a question about what affects their own action. Disclosure of experience can be distinguished from notice of a condition. Someone need not explain every reason in detail to say honestly that a promised meeting will not happen. Particular relationships may involve further agreements that this article does not prescribe. The distinction prevents a personal boundary from becoming universal permission to withhold necessary information about consequences of already agreed participation.

Conversely, a shared undertaking grants no complete access to a person. A listener may need an answer about a meeting's time without grounds for interrogating every inner doubt. These subjects should be named separately. In a mixed conversation, the information necessary for actual interaction can be identified alongside what someone wishes to retain privately. This promises no calm solution for every contradiction. Others may disagree with a boundary, while consequences of a particular agreement require separate consideration. Yet the distinction permits discussing the subject rather than opposing complete transparency and absolute inviolability as though these were the only possible relationships between people.

IX. A differing response need not end a relationship

A friend can understand why moving matters while evaluating the decision differently. Acknowledging feeling, understanding facts, and approving a choice are distinct responses. Confusing them can make every disagreement proof that we are not seen at all. Yet an actual conversation can include respect and dispute together. In our example, a friend asks about accessible conditions without denying the change's significance. This does not establish that the comment is correct. Content, grounds, and subject need examination. Respect requires no acceptance of a mistaken judgment; disagreement needs no attribution of hidden hostility. Closeness retains room to hear difference while actual treatment does not turn conversation into coercion or humiliation.

Limits on understanding likewise excuse no arbitrary behavior. If someone repeatedly dismisses speech, passes on entrusted material without consent, or demands the impossible, inevitable experiential difference cannot make this intimacy's compulsory price. This article evaluates no particular relationship and prescribes no next decision. Observable action should be named separately from a general feature of human experience. “You cannot feel everything identically” differs from “you told others something I asked you not to share.” One concerns coincidence's limits, the other a specific handling of trust. Clarification retains expectations of actual participation without demanding infallibility or abandoning boundaries because ideal understanding does not exist.

X. Another also remains incompletely known

Wanting recognition of one's complexity can obscure a listener's complexity. A friend becomes a function: listen correctly, answer promptly, feel the required joy. Yet their experience is not fully ours either. They may support the move while experiencing their own separation, or want conversation while lacking time. These are possible circumstances, not invented explanations of a particular silence. They show that the only known side of a relationship does not exhaust its situation. Another side can be approached through an accessible question and answer without advance possession of its motive. Experience's non-transferability is mutual: wanting to be heard grants no right to declare another's inner life already completely understood.

Reciprocity requires no identical amount of disclosure in every conversation. Today one person may need more attention and another consent to give it. Human equality does not mechanically divide every minute in half. Voluntariness, actual conditions, and room to change participation matter. A communicated limit deserves consideration as the listener's own answer rather than a malfunction of support. This does not prohibit wanting more or seeking another accessible form of contact. It prevents a wish from becoming another's existing obligation. Closeness can be asymmetrical on a particular evening while recognizing two people rather than one experiencing person and one necessary function beside them.

XI. Time alone can be a distinct way of living

Someone may choose an evening without conversation to unpack, read, or spend time in a new place. Being alone by itself establishes neither a broken relationship, well-being, nor distress. Wishes and circumstances matter and cannot be judged solely through absent company. A chosen solitary activity needs no justification through rejection of people. Someone can love a friend while not wanting discussion now. Peaceful solitude may also have been expected while unwanted disconnection emerged. This change needs honest naming rather than an obligation to defend an earlier choice at any cost. The article offers no diagnosis and infers no condition from contact numbers or time without a listener.

Experience's personal boundary should not become a rule against requesting help. If independent action fails to address an actual difficulty, a different subject and accessible support can be considered. Yet asking for support removes no right to time without conversation. These forms need not compete for the name of a correct life. In our move, someone may unpack alone today, discuss change tomorrow, and separately address a practical task with a competent participant. Each episode has conditions of its own. This account promises no removal of solitude and sets no schedule. It preserves distinctions among

wishes, actual relationships, and personal experience instead of treating every solitary interval as proof of exceptional nature or inevitable human disconnection.

XII. Closeness without complete coincidence

A relationship can be real although another does not feel the world identically. Its reality appears through known actions: hearing a question, clarifying, agreeing on help, sharing activity, or acknowledging an error. No single sign proves a particular connection's entire depth. They nevertheless permit discussing accessible participation rather than only impossible complete coincidence. Existential solitude as used here remains a personal boundary rather than a prohibition on intimacy. It decides neither how many people should be present nor what feeling someone must have. Further conversation concerns particular relationships and expectations that need discovery, discussion, and possibly revision through actual information.

Two points can coexist: my experience remains mine; another's participation can matter. The first devalues no assistance, while the second transfers no entire responsibility for an inner life. Ordinary difficulties remain between them: poorly chosen words, differing wishes, limited time. They need specific consideration rather than a final verdict that every understanding is impossible. Historical grounds offer differing foundations for friendship and mutual help; this article forms no compulsory doctrine from them. The contemporary question is narrower: what closeness can participants actually sustain while retaining their own position, attention, and right to a boundary? An answer can be partial without partiality alone making it false or humanly insignificant.

What this means in practice

Choose one ordinary episode in which closeness or understanding was wanted. Avoid a situation requiring assistance beyond your accessible competence. This voluntary practice clarifies conversation rather than assessing health or proving that solitude has been overcome. Reflection can stop if it becomes unwelcome. No personal disclosure to another is required merely to complete the exercise.

Describe the known event first: what you said, the response received, and what remains unknown. Separate a listener's action from assumptions about inward attitudes. Silence establishes an absent answer at that moment, not an automatic complete explanation of motive. If particular treatment violated an agreed boundary, name that action rather than dissolving it into a general thought that people never coincide completely.

Ask next what was expected. Was it discussion of facts, recognition of importance, presence without explanation, assistance with a task, or approval of a decision? Perhaps another was

expected to feel everything identically and thereby remove personal separateness. Such an expectation can be noticed without shame or an obligation to stop wanting intimacy immediately. Try naming a more specific subject that can actually be communicated. It need not exhaust experience.

If conversation is accessible and welcome to both, formulate one request with a clear boundary. Identify the part that matters or ask whether listening is possible now. A response retains a right to be limited. Avoid turning the request into a concealed examination where every differing answer proves a failed relationship. Equally, participation that misses the subject or violates consent need not be pronounced suitable. Clarification, refusal, and admitting uncertainty can also be honest outcomes.

Finally keep two notes together: what remained personally yours in this experience, and what another actually did or agreed to do. Neither must be subtracted from the other. If help was unavailable, that state can be named without a general verdict on oneself and everyone else. The practice guarantees no intimacy and replaces no appropriate assistance for a substantial difficulty. It clarifies a relationship's subject without demanding complete coincidence as human participation's only sign.

Key quotation

> *“he can do without friends, not that he desires to do without them.” — Seneca, Moral Letters to Lucilius IX.5, exact fragment of Richard M.Gummere's English translation.*

Connections between traditions

1. **Self-sufficiency and friendship: Seneca and Aristotle.** IX.5 retains a sage's desire for friends; EthicsIX.9 includes friends in good activity. Both preserve relationships alongside independence. Boundary: the Stoic supreme good and Aristotelian happiness have different grounds and form no single doctrine here.

2. **Friendship as participation: Seneca and a contemporary request.** IX.8 concerns acting for a friend rather than only receiving advantage. Here a request clarifies accessible participation. Both concern relationships through action. Boundary: heroic ideals and equanimity in loss are not prescribed; a request guarantees no answer.

3. **Shared activity without identity: Aristotle and personal experience.** IX.9 retains friends' discussion, thought, and action; this article distinguishes participation from identical experience. Both treat a relationship as actual participation. Boundary: original non-transferability is not attributed to Aristotle as a consciousness theory or psychological efficacy claim.

4. **Help has a subject: Ecclesiastes and accessible support.** 4:9–12 describes mutual assistance's advantages. The contemporary question clarifies a request, consent, and limits. Both concern particular action for another. Boundary: biblical wisdom guarantees no alliance's safety and requires no compulsory partner.

5. **Connection without eliminating separateness: three grounds and an original distinction.** Friendship for its own sake, shared activity, and mutual help permit relationships without promising identical experience. Boundary: this compares different foundations rather than diagnosing loneliness, supplying a clinical classification, or proving an intimacy technique.

Primary sources

1. Seneca, Moral LettersIX, Richard M.Gummere translation. Complete IX.1–22 actually read at displayed102–132; chiefly3–5,8,13–17 adopted. Linked title confirms Loeb, first printed1918, reprinted1925. Key fragmentIX.5 checked exactly; Russian rendering ours. Latin not collated; sage ideal not transferred as a grief rule.

2. Aristotle, Nicomachean EthicsIX, W.D.Ross translation. Complete IX.9 displayed122–137 read; shared activity and friends adopted. Adjacent sections not adopted as further grounds; historical inequalities are not contemporary norms here. Greek and exact print impression not collated.

3. Ecclesiastes4, KJV. Displayed4:1–16 actually read;4:7–12 adopted, epigraph4:9 checked exactly. Modern commentary excluded. Hebrew and a1611 facsimile not collated.

Named English translations used; Russian quotations rendered by United Wisdom. Short attributed quotation establishes no worldwide rights clearance, source import, or vectorization permission. Historical normative and religious grounds demonstrate no therapeutic effect and guarantee no intimacy.

Tags

existential solitude, intimacy, personal experience, understanding, friendship, relationships, presence, assistance, consent, boundaries, independence, time alone, disconnection, communication, openness, trust, reciprocity, expectations, participation, difference, responsibility, conversation, shared activity, attention, Seneca, Aristotle, Ecclesiastes, philosophy, religious foundations, United Wisdom

About the authors

Andrey Zarinsh is the author and founder of United Wisdom. He explores inner transformation, the unity of traditions, intercultural dialogue, and contemporary spiritual discipline. Instagram: @andrey.zarinsh.

Maria Evilkut is a co-author of United Wisdom. Alongside her research, she seeks to test these ideas in practice and observe how principles of unity and mutual understanding work in real life between people and cultures. Instagram: @ilkutki.