

UNITED WISDOM

Another person’s death and knowledge of our own finitude

Meaning and Direction

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

P-04-N04 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Another person’s death and knowledge of our own finitude

Epigraph

> *“Death, therefore, the most awful of evils, is nothing to us.”*

— Epicurus, Letter to Menoeceus, opening clause before the comma in the death argument; displayed Robert Drew Hicks translation. Closing punctuation is editorial; exact print-edition identity is not established.

What this article is about

We may have known about our own finitude for years and still encounter something unfamiliar in another person’s death. General knowledge of mortality differs from one particular absence: a familiar voice, a shared undertaking, the possibility of another conversation. This article considers that distinction without requiring loss to become a lesson or an immediate transformation of one’s whole life. Selected passages from Epicurus, Augustine and Psalm90 are compared while their different foundations are retained. Contemporary scenes are invented editorial examples rather than reports of established cases. Memory, attention to the living, an unknown future and a small decision belonging to the person remain central. No stages of grief, measure of love through emotion or promise of relief is offered. The purpose is language in which the absent person remains more than an instrument and finitude becomes no command to keep testing whether one is living correctly.

I. A general thought becomes a particular absence

Imagine someone learning that a longstanding acquaintance has died. They rarely met and were not especially close, but for several years they discussed a possible trip together. There will be no further “later” for that conversation. This invented scene neither describes stages of grief nor explains every reader's condition. It distinguishes the general thought that people are mortal from the particular absence of someone within a relationship. Mortality was already known, yet the event changes available possibilities: asking, meeting and continuing the conversation are no longer possible. A question about one's own life may arise. It is no compulsory lesson that everyone must immediately extract from another's death to demonstrate awareness or the correct relationship to a loss, nor a reason to assess someone who experiences the event differently.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Several questions can coexist within one event. What happened to another person? What changed for those connected with them? How do I understand my own finitude? They relate without becoming identical. Immediately making another's death an occasion to discuss only one's future can obscure their particular life. Forbidding all reflection on oneself can equally silence a question that has genuinely arisen. The article retains the distinction without prescribing an order of experiences. Someone can speak about memory, uncertainty, fear or an absence of a clear conclusion. These possibilities form no maturity scale. Their content deserves attention rather than comparison with the response supposedly expected of a person who understands life deeply enough. We do not need one interpretation to settle every relationship contained in the event.

Knowing a fact also differs from experiencing it. A statement about human mortality determines no required intensity of feeling today. Someone might be shaken by a stranger's death and respond quietly to news about an acquaintance; this article explains no reasons for those differences. Intensity alone establishes neither love, morality nor understanding. In our example, significance can appear quietly: a familiar possibility of conversation no longer exists. Reflection begins with attention to what has changed rather than a demand to feel strongly enough. An unclear question can remain unclear. Lacking ready words makes a relationship to the event neither empty nor wrong, and a later response need not be treated as less sincere because it did not appear at the moment when others expected it.

II. Another's absence cannot be replaced by a general explanation

In Confessions IV, Augustine recalls a friend's death: familiar places become painful and his own existence puzzling. This is retrospective Christian address to God, evaluating former attachment and love in God. It describes no universal mourner. Its bounded relevance is that general knowledge of mortality does not replace a relationship to particular absence. The theological grounds remain without becoming a compulsory explanation of the reader's feelings.

In our editorial scene, the trip was a possibility rather than the relationship's central content. The acquaintance had a life not reducible to serving as the narrator's conversation partner. Remembering them need not mean discovering exactly what their death taught me. We might recall a decision, a way of arguing, unfinished work or a story involving others. The essay prescribes no form of memory and requires no ideal image. Relationships may have been difficult and information incomplete. Respect for particularity allows difficulty to remain within the account while preventing our portion of knowledge from becoming a final biography. Another person does not become merely a symbol of finitude, even if their absence first gives

this question a special clarity for us or alters the way we understand a possibility once taken for granted.

A general explanation can help connect an event with a conviction without eliminating particular pain. Someone can believe in continuing life and miss a familiar voice, or regard death as the cessation of experience and feel another's absence. These are possible combinations within editorial reasoning, not research on believers and non-believers. A single experience proves no worldview's truth and establishes no inconsistency in its holder. Philosophical argument, religious conviction and everyday relationship address different tasks. They can converse without automatically replacing one another. When someone wants to remember a friend, an answer solely about death's nature may not address their question, even if the argument matters elsewhere. The difference concerns the conversation's purpose rather than a requirement that one position defeat the others before any memory can be acknowledged.

III. What the argument about death and sensation explains

In the Letter to Menoeceus, Epicurus relates good and evil to sensation and death to its absence. His argument concerns our death not meeting us as an experienced state. This belongs to his philosophical account, not measured evidence about fear. We distinguish that question from another person's absence for the living. The argument establishes no unchanged relationships or duty to stop grieving.

Consider two statements: “I will not experience a state in which I do not exist” and “I find it difficult to imagine a world without this person.” Accepting the first does not automatically refute the second. The latter concerns present imagination and relationship rather than a dead person's future sensation. An unfinished conversation likewise poses a different question from whether death itself will be experienced. The distinction permits consideration of the historical argument without using it as a command to another person. It might clarify a particular fear without promising to remove the entire experience. A philosophical thought need not perform every possible task in a conversation about finitude to matter, nor should its value depend on producing feelings it never established that it could produce for every reader.

We can also reject Epicurus's premise or retain doubt. The essay requires no resolution of disputes about consciousness and posthumous existence before acknowledging a particular absence. One philosophical position should not become a neutral fact shared by every tradition. Readers may understand death differently, in which case the conversation should name its different grounds instead of hiding them behind similar language about life's value. Agreement to care for someone living does not imply agreement about what follows death. Limited common ground permits companionship without compulsory worldview conversion. It proves neither that different accounts are equally true nor that further debate is forbidden

when participants actually wish to pursue it. The boundary simply prevents a practical agreement or a moment of support from being mistaken for assent to an entire doctrine.

IV. Finitude provides no timetable

Knowing that life is finite differs from knowing how much time remains. An acquaintance's death may make the former more noticeable without establishing the latter. In our scene, someone thinks that because the trip never happened, every postponed plan must now be realised immediately. The event establishes no equal importance, availability or wisdom of every intention today. A decision needs relationships, resources and consequences. This essay forecasts no lifespan and recommends no reorganisation of life under the force of a single announcement. Its narrower question is which “later” was an actual plan, which was habitual language, and which had neither a date nor the agreement of people whose participation was needed. A new sense of urgency can be acknowledged without treating it as complete information about every proposed change.

Psalm90 in King James Version addresses the Lord in asking to number our days. Human brevity, divine wrath, mercy and established human work belong to its context. It is prayer, not a productivity exercise. Our comparison concerns finite time while retaining religious grounds. Numbering days supplies no exact personal deadline or obligation to turn every minute into a visible achievement.

Our editorial application distinguishes valuing time from constantly hurrying. Some important things need consent, preparation or space for rest among obligations. Living finite time does not remove conditions that give an action meaning. If the trip mattered as an encounter with someone, mechanically visiting the place now does not necessarily fulfil the former intention. A new undertaking involving others cannot be directed solely through our urgency. Reflection can clarify the question without automatically deciding it for everyone. An honest result may be recognising that a former possibility has closed while a new one needs different grounds and separate agreement. We need not prove that nothing significant was lost to justify considering a new action, nor turn an unavailable plan into a debt that the remaining people must now fulfil.

V. Memory need not become a programme of change

After another's death, someone may be urged to live differently: value each day, fulfil a dream or revise relationships. Such proposals may match an intention or become another demand. They are possible conversational statements here, not data about society's behaviour. Where does the next step arise? Do I want to continue a task, speak to someone living, or demonstrate sufficient change so that memory will not be called empty? The event establishes no single programme. We can retain a relationship without a major decision, or decide without announcing that someone's death happened for our lesson. Memory and change can connect without compulsory causation. The resulting choice deserves its own explanation rather than depending on a claim that a particular transformation is the only way to respect someone who is absent.

Suppose the acquaintance participated in a small shared project. Another person wants to continue it but does not know which direction they would have preferred. Known agreements can be distinguished from a present personal decision. The former rest on information; the latter needs honest ownership. An absent person's voice should not automatically grant a current choice final authority. This forbids neither action nor continuation of unfinished work. It marks a limit of knowledge. Living participants can recognise their grounds and remaining assumptions. Respect for memory is compatible with independently continuing where new decisions are not presented as the precisely known will of someone who cannot be asked. Acknowledging that limitation can preserve the relationship more carefully than confident claims made on their behalf to settle every disagreement among those remaining.

Memory need not erase difficult aspects of a relationship. We can appreciate something important without declaring every action right, regret an unfinished conversation without knowing whether reconciliation would have followed, or retain a warm story while recognising that others knew the person differently. The essay proposes no public disclosure and no duty to recount everything. It concerns accuracy in our understanding: absence does not complete our information. An impeccable legend can remove the particular person with choices, errors and relationships; an account consisting solely of accusation can remove another part. Honesty permits incompleteness without requiring a final judgement on a life no single story can exhaust. Some questions can remain unanswered without reducing either our knowledge or the relationship to whatever conclusion is easiest to express at present.

VI. Care for the living has its own grounds

Another's death may involve tasks concerning the living: sustaining a conversation, communicating information or agreeing on a small shared action. Philosophical reflection replaces none of these relationships. In our scene, someone can ask another participant whether help with an available task is wanted. They do not already know that person's feelings or wishes. An offer retains respect when refusal is possible and no immediate account of experience is demanded. This essay establishes no procedure following death and gives no professional recommendations. It considers a limited ethical point: a living person should have room to determine their participation even when others are confident they know a helpful form of memory or support. The proposed help should therefore remain a proposal rather than an interpretation of the person that they are expected to accept.

A shared conviction is not necessary for every form of assistance. One participant may pray while another rejects the religious account, yet they can agree on a particular task. That agreement should not be treated as concealed endorsement of everyone's grounds. Joint action resolves no dispute about posthumous existence. It may require a clear object, voluntary participation and respect for boundaries. A religious form should be identified; participation that does not imply assent also needs explanation without promising that every ritual in an entire tradition works identically. The essay leaves communities' actual rules to their particular content. Bounded cooperation retains worldview differences without using another's death to require conversion, abandonment of faith or proof of agreement. Someone can decline one form of participation and remain willing to discuss another without that choice becoming a verdict on their concern for others.

Care can be small without resembling a profound answer about life's meaning. Clarifying an agreement, leaving room for silence or completing a promised part concerns a particular relationship. We need not call it a universal solution to pain for it to matter. Kindly intention does not make every method appropriate, however: unnecessary intervention, an imposed conversation or promises made for others may need revision. Assistance retains room for clarification in our editorial perspective. We can ask whether an offer helped and hear a different answer without demanding gratitude. Another's finitude removes no living person's agency, just as our reflection on death grants no special authority over their time, information or way of relating to memory. A modest contribution can retain its boundary and still participate in the shared situation honestly.

VII. A small decision instead of putting a whole life on trial

Return to the person recalling the unrealised trip. They may conclude that their entire life was postponed and must now immediately become real. Yet one closed conversation provides no complete knowledge of former decisions. Some plans may have mattered, others remained secondary for understandable reasons, and others depended on resources or consent. The essay automatically excuses no postponement. It avoids turning a particular loss into a general verdict without examination. A still-significant wish needs its own object: what do I want to do now, with whom, and under which conditions? A wish tied specifically to the absent person can be acknowledged as irrecoverable without inventing a replacement for compulsory continuation. Recognising that difference may be more accurate than demanding every former intention find a new form to prove that reflection was useful.

A small decision can matter without a large promise. Someone can arrange a conversation with a living acquaintance, check a possibility of meeting, or record a story they do not want to forget. The action should follow the present relationship rather than a demand to demonstrate transformation. Another participant's consent matters; our understanding makes their time no freely available resource. Recording personal information grants no automatic right to publish it. If a possibility is unavailable, that should not become another accusation of insufficient understanding of finitude. Our perspective retains actual conditions and recognises that life's value is not measured by the number of decisions made under the impression of one event. A choice may be modest, postponed or declined with reasons while the question remains meaningful.

Sometimes the next step is no new decision. Someone may not know what they want or lack an available opportunity. That proves no fruitless reflection. A question can become clearer without becoming a programme yet. We prescribe no deadline after which uncertainty becomes wrong. Waiting should not become a final answer to everything either: a known commitment to someone living is not automatically cancelled by a question about meaning. The distinction returns to particulars. What remains open, and what was already agreed? Where is a pause needed, and where is communication needed? A small decision is determined through relationship rather than constant proof that encountering finitude made someone entirely different in every part of life. Thought and an existing obligation can therefore have different timelines without either being dismissed.

VIII. Uncertainty requires no ready legend

Another's death can leave questions nobody present can answer. What did they think about unfinished work, how did they understand relationships, and what remained untold? We may want to complete the story because incompleteness is difficult. A comforting answer becomes no knowledge through comfort alone. Our narrator does not know why the trip was delayed: time, money, interest or another reason remains unestablished. Retaining the question is better than declaring a hidden wish frustrated solely through the narrator's fault. This forbids no search for available information. It marks the boundary between fact, assumption and a story we create rather than accurately known inner life. The boundary can remain visible even when an interpretation seems plausible or is shared by several people who would like the same ending.

The same accuracy matters for one's future. Knowing finitude reveals no complete meaning of the remaining life. A task can matter without a known result; a revised conviction can remain short of a final system; faith can persist without an answer to every difficulty. We offer no universal worldview exit. Grounds and knowledge's boundary can be stated separately. I can choose through present understanding without declaring it the final truth about the entire future. Uncertainty does not make every action equivalent to every other: reasons, consent and consequences remain open to examination. It prevents promises of completeness where none exists and requires no fabricated confidence for an elegant ending. A decision can be sufficiently grounded for its present scope while larger questions remain unsettled and deserving of further thought at another time.

Historical texts do not automatically remove this boundary. We can read carefully, compare arguments, and distinguish agreement with a particular thought from accepting an entire teaching. A quotation reveals neither a living person's feelings nor a deceased acquaintance's will. Religious trust also differs from an established personal forecast: someone can interpret an event through faith without offering their interpretation as a demonstrated explanation for everyone. Different grounds remain different here. An honest conversation permits “I understand it this way” alongside “I do not know this.” Such a boundary makes thought neither necessarily weak nor meaningless. It relates the account to actual knowledge and leaves room for another person's different response rather than treating their participation as evidence that they must share every premise behind the speaker's interpretation.

IX. A finite life remains life among people

Reflection on death is sometimes described as returning to what matters most. This essay establishes no identical list for everyone. Relationships, commitments, wishes and questions cannot be ranked solely through the strength of today's impression. Finitude can make choice more noticeable without removing its complexity. Life continues among people retaining their own boundaries and grounds. New understanding therefore needs discussable language: what matters to me, which action do I propose, what do I not know, and what depends on another? Specificity need not reduce the question's depth. It lets thought enter actual relationships instead of becoming a general requirement that everyone immediately live as one participant now considers right. An important insight can still require consent, explanation and a realistic account of the conditions through which it might become action.

The sources provide different perspectives. Epicurus considers death and sensation; Augustine remembers loss in addressing God; the psalm relates brief days to prayer. These form neither one account of posthumous existence nor a shared technique for experiencing loss. Bounded comparison distinguishes conversational objects while retaining grounds. Readers are not asked to select the correct feeling through a quotation. They may find a clarifying thought or recognise that the text does not serve their present task. Neither response proves deficient understanding. Reflection remains an invitation allowing agreement, disagreement and a pause, without determining a person's path after someone's death.

The trip with the acquaintance can no longer happen. A slogan about valuing each day cannot repair that fact. We can acknowledge particular absence, retain incomplete memory and name current relationships more attentively. Perhaps someone will discuss a possible meeting with another person; perhaps they will only notice that habitual “later” promises no future. Neither response must settle every question. Another's death remains particular, personal finitude concerns one's own life, and care for the living requires consent and attention. Retaining these distinctions does not separate people; it prevents one thought from governing every experience. Finite time can be acknowledged without turning the remaining life into a continual examination of the correct understanding of death. Our participation can remain real and bounded even when the larger question still has no final answer.

What this means in practice

If you wish to continue, choose a small question that can be considered quietly rather than the most difficult episode. You need not approach a personal loss at all; an invented example from the article is enough. Record one distinction: what you know about finitude generally, and what belongs to this particular person’s absence. Do not require the second item to explain the first. List no correct emotions or measures of the relationship’s depth. If the question is too difficult now, the exercise can be declined or stopped without a judgement on your readiness.

Next, name what you do not know. It might be another person’s wish, a past conversation’s circumstances or a living companion’s possible response. Retain the unknown as unknown. Alongside it, record an action available without an invented answer: establish a fact, ask consent, offer modest help, allow time for memory or make no change yet. If the action concerns another’s story, identify whose permission is needed and what should remain private. Another person’s refusal remains an answer, not proof of an incorrect relationship to death.

Finally, consider the step’s size. Does it require revising an entire life immediately, or concern a particular undertaking and available time? A further question can remain open without a promise of final clarity. Do not present your decision as the absent person’s commission where no commission existed. This is voluntary editorial practice in philosophical attention rather than an established way of undergoing grief, restoring connection or predicting the future. It defines no normal experience and replaces no necessary support. One honest distinction, or recognising that reflection is unwelcome today, is enough; reaching the end of an article creates no obligation to complete an exercise.

Key quotation

> *“So teach us to number our days.”*

— Psalm90:12, opening clause before the comma, King James Version numbering. Closing punctuation is editorial; the verse continues towards wisdom and the whole Psalm remains a prayer.

Connections between traditions

1. **One's death and a friend's absence: Epicurus and Augustine.** In the Letter to Menoeceus death argument, Epicurus connects good and evil with sensation; in Confessions IV.4–6, Augustine describes a living person's pain after a friend's death. Both address a person's relationship to death but examine different sides: a dead person's lack of sensation is not the survivor's lack of pain. Augustine retains an address to God, Epicurus a different philosophical argument. Their comparison neither denies grief's reality nor turns Epicurus's reasoning into an order to stop mourning.

2. **A finite life and its uncertain number of days: Epicurus and Psalm90.** In the adopted passage, Epicurus distinguishes a pleasant life from merely increasing its duration; Psalm90:10–12 connects brief days with a request for wisdom. The limited resemblance is that a relationship to life exceeds its quantity. But Epicurus reasons about mortality and sensation, whereas the psalm addresses the Lord amid wrath, mercy and human work. This supplies no shared teaching about a correct timetable: neither the comparison nor the named numbers establishes a personal death date or requires haste to satisfy someone else's account of a full life.

3. **Addressing God in sorrow: Augustine and Psalm90.** In Confessions IV.5–7, Augustine addresses God while remembering tears and an inability to find rest; Psalm90:13–15 asks for mercy and gladness after days of affliction. The resemblance concerns religious address that does not conceal suffering. Their genres and subjects differ: a personal retrospective account of a friend is not the community's prayer across generations. They cannot be assembled into compulsory grief stages; immediate relief cannot be taken as evidence of correct faith, and no outcome of prayer should be promised to the reader.

4. **Continuing life and relationships: Augustine and Epicurus.** In IV.8, Augustine describes conversation, shared reading and friendship after loss; Epicurus's death argument considers a wise person's relation to remaining life and its quality. The limited resemblance is that reflection on death remains connected to how living people live. Augustine's renewed companionship, however, does not illustrate agreement with Epicurus: Augustine evaluates love before God, while the philosophical argument has different grounds. Our possibility of modest shared care is a practical proposal that requires no replacing the dead person with a new relationship.

5. **Care and its grounds: Augustine and Psalm90.** In IV.9, Augustine distinguishes loving a friend from loving a friend in God; Psalm90:16–17 asks that God's work appear and the work of human hands be established. The limited resemblance places a human relationship or work within an address to God rather than an autonomous human guarantee. Augustine concerns love and loss, the psalm God's action and human labour. Agreed assistance in our scene

proves neither ground and makes agreement with them no condition of care; unknown wishes of the deceased remain unknown.

Primary sources

1. Epicurus. Letter to Menoeceus, selected death argument; displayed Robert Drew Hicks translation.

2. Augustine. Confessions IV4–9; J. G. Pilkington translation: a friend's death recalled in Christian address to God.

3. Complete Psalm90, King James Version: finitude, mercy and the work of human hands.

Actual reading and limits are recorded in the notes. Russian quotations are United Wisdom translations from the identified English versions; Greek and Hebrew originals were not collated. Contemporary scenes and practice are editorial work with no established efficacy.

Tags

death, finitude, life, memory, absence, relationship, friend, loss, mortality, future, uncertainty, attention, care, consent, help, choice, decision, time, meaning, dignity, agency, boundaries, philosophy of life, Epicurus, Augustine, Psalm, prayer, faith, experience, humanity

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.