

UNITED WISDOM

Remembering someone while continuing your own life

Meaning and Direction

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

P-15-N03 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Remembering someone while continuing your own life

Epigraph

> *“I became a great puzzle to myself”.*

Augustine, Confessions IV.4.9, opening clause of a sentence; J. G. Pilkington's translation as revised for New Advent.

What this article is about

After someone close dies, a new decision can become a question of loyalty. Can a habit change, a familiar place be visited with another person, or an invitation accepted while memory remains? This article distinguishes preserving a relationship's significance from continually repeating its previous outward form. Memory need not prove itself through uninterrupted pain, but neither should it be ordered to become pleasant. We turn to Seneca's Letter 63, selected chapters of Augustine's Confessions Book IV, and Ecclesiastes 9. Their positions differ: Stoic counsel about recollection, Christian reflection on attachment, and earthly participation under the sun are no single technique. Every scene here is imagined. We give no diagnosis, set no deadlines, and promise no relief through changing an object or decision. The nearer question is what can be retained as a real history and what remains our own choice under circumstances another person can no longer assess together with us.

I. An invitation beside an old notebook

Imagine a hypothetical scene. Someone is sorting a shelf and finds a notebook belonging to a loved one who has died. One page names a place they hoped to visit together. On the same day, an invitation arrives to spend a weekend in a quite different way. The question of a journey unexpectedly becomes a question of loyalty: would accepting mean that the previous life no longer matters? The notebook issues no such demand, but its presence makes the decision difficult. An invisible argument opens between the object and the future. It seems as though memory can be preserved only by refusing to let a new event occupy a place once connected with another person.

We do not know how the participant feels or which decision fits their situation. There is no need to send them away for the weekend in advance or persuade them to remain home. First, the connection itself can be examined: are remembering someone and repeating the previous form of life the same action? Memory retains an image, an event, a voice, or a relationship's

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

significance. Repetition preserves a route, a habit, or an object on a particular shelf. Sometimes they help each other; sometimes they diverge. An unchanged shelf guarantees no living relationship, while an altered route establishes no forgetting. There is more room for the question when every change ceases to count as a final verdict on the meaning of an entire past life.

This article concerns that room. It promises no relief from sorrow and proposes no form of commemoration suitable for everyone. Its narrower question is how to continue choosing when an important relationship belongs to the past but its significance remains present. Memory is not treated as a medical function or measured by the frequency of recollection. The subject is the meaning someone gives their actions. A particular story can be preserved while an ordinary habit changes; someone can be unready for change without declaring it forbidden forever. The conflict between preservation and movement deserves attentive distinctions rather than an order to turn it quickly into an attractive lesson.

II. Memory is not identical to continuous pain

Loyalty can quietly become tied to repeating a painful condition. If pain lessens for even one evening, someone may ask whether they have forgotten too quickly. That judgement turns experience into proof of a relationship. But the intensity of today's pain and a person's significance in our life are different subjects. One need not be inferred from the other. A funny remark can be remembered with laughter without declaring the loss unimportant. Someone may also feel entirely unready for joy without making that evidence of exceptional depth of love. Both conditions belong to a living person and need not become a comparative scale of loyalty.

The distinction does not mean recollection must become pleasant. It may remain difficult, unexpected, and different on different days. We prescribe no feeling to acquire when looking at a photograph. Instead, one additional demand is removed: proving memory through a particular feeling. A relationship has other traces as well—a story, knowledge of someone, a question received from them, a retained activity, or a deliberately altered habit. These traces do not form a compulsory list either. No one needs to create a commemorative project to defend the right to continue living. Our thought concerns freedom from a single indicator rather than replacing that indicator with a new collection of assignments.

There is an opposite risk: others may declare pain unnecessary because memory can be preserved differently. A reasonable distinction then becomes a means of making someone feel less. We cannot know beforehand which recollection is currently bearable or which object supports and which wounds. The person should retain the right to describe this, change an answer, and leave some things unexplained. Continuing one's own life does not require denying a difficult feeling. It means only that the future need not be subordinated in advance to

one condition: being an exact copy of the past. Even a decision to change nothing today can remain a decision for today, rather than a lifelong agreement with loss.

III. Seneca: presence without the former presence

In Letter 63, Seneca directly addresses the fear of forgetting a dead friend. Paragraph three challenges a memory that lasts only as long as sorrow continues. Two different images of recollection then emerge. His teacher Attalus describes pleasure with a bitter element, while in paragraph seven Seneca prefers his own image: after losing friends, he relates to them as though he still has them. A distinction can be seen here between factual presence and continuing significance. An ordinary action cannot bring the person back, but absence does not empty the relationship's entire history of meaning. This transition proves no literal presence of the dead and requires no such belief.

Seneca nevertheless wants recollection to become pleasant, and makes strong claims about replacing a lost friend with another attachment. His confidence is no universal description of every person. The letter should not become an instruction for the feeling that must emerge after the required number of days. For our subject, the separation between memory and unchanging sorrow is valuable; the prescribed emotional result remains contestable. We can retain the distinction while declining to demand its fulfilment in a pleasant condition. This matters especially when a reader hears in any calmness another person's expectation of a swift return to a convenient life, and fears that their recollection will be judged incorrect.

The author's harsh judgements about friendship also remain in paragraphs nine to eleven. New relationships are offered as an answer to loss, but a person is not an interchangeable object. Continuing life may include friendship with others without describing them as replacements for the person who died. A new conversation will have its own history, its own differences, and permission not to match the previous relationship. This permits a critical reading of Seneca: accepting the possibility of relationship after loss while declining the language of equivalent replacement. Continuation need not erase an absent person's name. It can leave that name a particular place while acknowledging that other living people have separate significance, rather than serving as instruments of our recovery.

IV. Augustine: a familiar place became different

In Book IV of the Confessions, Augustine recalls a friend's death and describes the transformation of everything familiar. Places where they had shared life became tormenting; his gaze continued seeking someone who could no longer arrive. In chapter four, paragraph nine, he becomes a puzzle to himself. The account reveals a particular structure of loss: not merely one fact but the way of meeting the familiar world has changed. For our subject, an object or route may retain a trace of togetherness. These are more than mere objects, but their significance is not locked inside them permanently as one instruction for every future action.

The account belongs to a particular life and is written as an address to God from a later Christian position. Augustine evaluates his own former attachment and conception of God. His spiritual conclusion cannot explain every reader's pain as insufficient faith. Nor do we diagnose a historical author through his words or turn relocation into a psychological technique. His described experience helps formulate a question: why does a familiar street suddenly feel different? This article's answer concerns a relationship's meaning rather than a clinical explanation. Shared life left a trace, and the participant's absence changes how that trace is read without destroying the reality of everything that came before.

In our imagined scene, the notebook can be just such a trace. Today it prompts a question about an unfulfilled journey, tomorrow a recollection of handwriting, and later a wish to tell someone about the person. This is no necessary progression through set stages, nor evidence that each subsequent meaning is better. The notebook can be put in a box, left on the shelf, or left undecided for now. No choice, by itself, establishes the depth of memory. What differs is the current way of handling a particular object. Memory is permitted a history after the person's death rather than remaining an obligation to reproduce endlessly the first encounter with their absence in every familiar place.

V. New closeness does not erase the previous relationship

In chapter eight, Augustine describes time and the involvement of other friends. He names conversations, reading, jokes, differences of opinion, and joy at meeting. These relationships helped him, but the account does not conclude that making new friends is enough. In the following chapter he turns towards love in God, who cannot be lost. Both parts need retaining: concrete togetherness and a distinctive spiritual conclusion. Otherwise, the text becomes a simple recommendation to fill an empty place with any new company. Our reflection concerns something else: relationships with the living may continue after loss without making every new person equivalent to someone who is no longer here.

New closeness can feel like breaking an unspoken agreement with the past. Someone fears telling an acquaintance a joke formerly shared only with one friend, or visiting a familiar place

with another companion. What exactly is being preserved can be asked: the person's uniqueness, exclusive rights over every future conversation, or one's own habit of connecting an action only with them? These questions demand no immediate change of habit. They reveal that a relationship's uniqueness need not depend on permanently closing every outward form it took. Another conversation does not rewrite the previous one. It occurs in another time and can matter without being assigned the task of occupying someone else's place.

New people must not become obliged to sustain our recollection in a prescribed way either. They may not understand the shared history, enjoy the familiar book, or wish to be compared with the person who died. Respect includes their right to differ. This also protects memory: it need not be diminished to establish that a new friendship is good enough. Earlier and later relationships can be incomparable in an important sense—each develops with a particular person. Continuing one's life means allowing room for those differences. It is no requirement to seek new connections. Solitude or limited company does not establish a refusal of life either, provided the chosen form is not turned into a universal rule.

VI. Ecclesiastes: life under the sun does not wait for an explanation

Ecclesiastes 9 places finitude beside participation in life still available to the living. Verses five and six concern the ending of the dead person's former participation in events under the sun; verses seven to ten turn attention towards food, relationships, and work. This is no simple movement from sorrow to compulsory joy. God, the portion allotted to a person, and the limited horizon of earthly action remain within the text. For our subject, the tension matters: remembering finitude does not cancel a living person's ability to meet someone, undertake an activity, or receive today's food. These possibilities do not become invalid because a complete explanation of loss cannot be given.

The verse about the dead being forgotten must not become a verdict against personal recollection. The chapter's question is wider than our individual relationships and concerns the limits of earthly participation. It does not follow that photographs must be erased, stories stopped, or commemoration abandoned. Nor can the call to joy become a reproach against someone who does not feel it now. We use the distinction between an ended earthly participation and the living person's continuing choice, rather than deducing rules for grieving. Future action is possible alongside memory, but its appropriateness must be decided in particular circumstances, not displaced by a general command to enjoy every day.

Verses eleven and twelve add limits concerning outcome and time. Speed, strength, and skill do not ensure results, and a person does not know their hour. Continuing life is therefore no bargain: if I return to new activities, the future must become favourable. A decision can be

reasonable and still fail to fulfil a hope. It may bring no expected joy yet retain a particular possibility of participation. In our scene, the journey need not become a happy turning point. Someone can accept the invitation, experience different feelings, and then alter plans. A living choice retains significance without proving that the story of loss has finally reached a satisfactory ending and will never return.

VII. An object keeps a trace but does not govern a life

Objects readily acquire an authority they do not possess in themselves. An armchair cannot be moved because someone sat there; a cup cannot be changed because it was their gift; a note cannot be discarded although only an illegible scrap remains. Preservation may have a meaning chosen by the person and need no justification. Difficulty arises when an object becomes a condition governing the acceptability of every future step. The question is then not simply about a thing but about an unspoken rule: altering a material trace will erase the relationship itself. That rule can be examined without proposing an immediate rearrangement of the furniture or decisive disposal of the entire past.

An object's history, its present storage, and a person's significance can be distinguished. The history cannot change: the gift was given, the chair used, the note written. Storage can sometimes change through photographing, putting away, passing something to a relative, or continuing to use it. None is universally best. A person's significance exceeds a single material proof, yet it need not exist without objects. Someone may value keeping them; another may prefer a story. Freedom lies not in defeating possessions but in choosing a connection's form without the threat that a different choice will automatically be called forgetting. Joint ownership also requires agreement, since one participant's personal meaning does not cancel others' rights.

In our scene, the person might write one line beside the place name: we wanted to go there together. The note will fulfil no unrealised journey and complete no history. It merely separates a particular past fact from today's decision about a different invitation. Both can remain together: an unfulfilled shared plan and a new possibility. If writing is too difficult, it need not be done. The object can be put aside for now without a large explanation. This article offers no liberation ritual and guarantees no altered feeling after the action. It shows that a material trace permits several forms of presence; love itself does not require maintaining a single form.

VIII. Not making the dead author every decision

A particular phrase appears in discussions of loyalty: they would have wanted me to do exactly this. Sometimes an explicitly stated wish is genuinely remembered. Sometimes an answer is inferred from the shared history. Sometimes the formula voices one's own hope or fear. Distinguishing these matters because the imagined voice can acquire unlimited authority over the future. Every decision must then be checked for invisible approval, while uncertainty becomes a prohibition. Memory of a living relationship turns into mandatory consultation with someone unable to answer, reconsider, or learn about new circumstances. The living participant's freedom disappears despite an intention to preserve the connection with care.

A known wish can be respected without presenting inference as certain knowledge. For example: they really said this activity mattered; I do not know how they would judge the current situation. Or: this option fits what I remember, but I make the final choice now. These words do not reject the past. They maintain its boundaries. Someone we loved had their own life and was not merely a function supplying correct decisions for us. Turning them after death into an infallible inward command narrows the image beyond the actual relationship, which could include uncertainty, disagreement, change, and each participant's right to a separate perspective.

This thought does not concern the legal force of documents or particular inheritance obligations, which require suitable sources and professional assessment. We discuss the inward meaning of personal choice. Gratitude, incomplete knowledge, and present responsibility can be acknowledged together. A new decision need not express the dead person's opinion or pretend to fulfil it in order to be permissible. It belongs to someone living in changed circumstances. The relationship with the past can contribute as a significant voice among other reasons, rather than the sole authority licensing every future joy, friendship, or alteration. Such contribution preserves memory without an invented entitlement to speak in another person's name.

IX. Shared memory can have several voices

People close to the same person may remember different sides of their life. Journeys matter to one, kitchen conversations to another, and difficult relationships that never became simple to a third. These accounts need not form one flawless biography. Sometimes there is pressure to preserve only a bright image; sometimes a demand to treat one painful evaluation as final. Our question requires no official shared portrait. The right to describe one's experience can be distinguished from a claim to establish another person's entire significance for everyone. Relational memory remains partial: each participant met the person from their own position, at a particular time, and under particular conditions.

This does not make every assertion equally true. Facts can be checked, mistakes corrected, and serious testimony should not be erased for an attractive story. Yet differences in personal significance are not always factual errors. One participant keeps a gift while another does not wish to retain objects; one marks a date with relatives while another prefers to spend it separately. These cases benefit from discussing a particular joint action rather than deciding who loves correctly. A shared object or gathering requires consent and limits of participation. The personal right to a form of memory confers no right to force others to adopt it.

Continuing life may therefore require a new language for family agreements. For example: preserving this story matters to me, but I am not asking you to feel the same; I am unready for the shared gathering, but that does not mean rejecting the person. Such a sentence guarantees no understanding, particularly in difficult relationships. It merely makes a distinction visible and leaves less room for assuming that matching forms must prove a connection. In our scene, someone can go away for the weekend while keeping a separate note about the unfulfilled plan. Another relative can choose differently. The difference need not automatically become a dispute over who possesses authentic memory and who is entitled to live after loss.

X. Continuing does not mean closing the story

The person in our scene may accept the invitation or decline for now. The fact of a journey supplies no required answer. The more important change concerns the reason: a decision need no longer prove loyalty through immutability. Someone can say they want a new experience today while acknowledging the unfinished shared plan. They can remain home without declaring every future departure a betrayal. In either case the past retains its reality without requiring one continuation. This guarantees no calm. Sometimes the distinction clarifies a thought while feeling remains difficult. Feeling need not immediately follow an argument for that argument to retain a limited purpose.

Memory may keep changing because the person remembering changes. A previous conversation is understood differently, something overlooked becomes visible, thanks are given for particular assistance, or a difficult part of a relationship is acknowledged. Such revision does not necessarily destroy the initial love. It may make an account more accurate while retaining several irreducible aspects. No one is obliged to work continuously on memory, however. Sometimes living an ordinary day and letting recollection appear without an assignment is enough. Sometimes support is needed when engaging with the past becomes unmanageable. This article neither assesses the reader's condition nor promises a therapeutic result or sets a frequency of recollection that counts as healthy or correct.

The sources help retain differences. Seneca separates memory from sorrow's duration but prescribes a desired feeling; Augustine describes a changed world and renewed relationships

within a Christian address to God; Ecclesiastes concerns participation available to the living under the sun without guaranteed outcomes. They cannot be assembled into one recipe. Between them we construct our own limited conclusion: memory does not require freezing every form of life, and continuation does not require erasing the previous relationship. A history can be retained, a new choice permitted, and no action today treated as a final answer about all love. Life after loss remains the person's own, where the past matters without an invented right to prohibit every future.

What this means in practice

If the question is bearable now, choose one small change you are actually considering. It may concern a habit, an object's position, or an optional invitation. Avoid something requiring a legal or professional decision, and do not force yourself towards a particularly difficult recollection.

Try naming three things separately: which past fact you wish to retain, which present form could remain or change, and which future choice belongs to you. For example, a shared travel plan remains part of the history, the notebook can be stored differently, and a new invitation needs a separate decision. This distinction does not oblige you to choose change.

If you refer to the dead person's wish, clarify whether it was actually expressed or is your current inference. A limit of knowledge can be acknowledged without rejecting gratitude. With a shared object or occasion, consider other participants and their consent.

Stopping is permissible too. The exercise promises no correct feeling and measures no loyalty. Later you can revisit the question, retain the previous form, or find another connection with the past. If engaging with memory is unmanageable, support should not depend on successful completion of this enquiry. Its purpose is to reveal a distinction rather than complete grief or establish the sole permissible form of life.

Key quotation

> *“I have lost them as if I have them still”.*

Seneca, Letter 63.7, closing clause of the sentence; Richard M. Gummere's translation.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Connections between traditions

1. **Memory and pain — Seneca 63.3–7; Augustine IV.4.9–IV.5.10.** Seneca separates memory from sorrow's duration and prefers pleasant recollection; Augustine describes a changed world and questions tears' sweetness from a later time. The shared question is whether altered feeling means the relationship has disappeared. The resemblance is that experience and significance do not remain one fixed quantity. Here it permits questioning pain as the sole proof of memory. The boundary is that Seneca prescribes a desired condition, while Augustine confessionally interprets his own history. Neither account establishes a compulsory emotional outcome for a reader.

2. **Other friends and a person's irreplaceability — Seneca 63.10–11; Augustine IV.8.13.** Seneca proposes another love using the language of replacement; Augustine describes particular conversations and togetherness with other friends while retaining criticism of his former spiritual position. The shared question is how a new relationship enters life after loss. The resemblance is limited to the possibility of participating in company again. For this article, the mechanism is distinction: a new person has their own history rather than an assignment to replace someone. The boundary is that this is a critical editorial conclusion, not complete agreement with Seneca's formula or removal of Augustine's theological context.

3. **A changed place and ended earthly participation — Augustine IV.4.9; Ecclesiastes 9:5–6.** Augustine's familiar places become different through a friend's absence; Ecclesiastes speaks of the dead person's participation in events under the sun as ended. The shared question concerns what absence changes without making the past unreal. Their resemblance lies in the rupture of former togetherness, illuminating an object's or route's new meaning. The boundary is that a place's personal history differs from a general statement about earthly participation. The verse about forgetting is no order to erase individual memory. The comparison establishes neither knowledge of the dead person's condition nor a clinical model of recollection.

4. **Participation available to the living — Seneca 63.8–9; Ecclesiastes 9:7–10.** Seneca recalls time with friends still alive; Ecclesiastes returns attention to food, relationships, and work within one's allotted portion. The shared question is whether today's choice can matter without a final answer about loss. The resemblance concerns available action within finite time. Here it preserves a new invitation's significance without demanding replacement of the past. The boundary is that Seneca makes strict moral evaluations, while Ecclesiastes links the portion with God and calls for joy. We do not transfer these into compulsory joy, company, or productivity for a bereaved person.

5. **A continuing connection and its basis — Seneca 63.7; Augustine IV.9.14.** Seneca describes lost friends as though he still has them; Augustine places love of a friend within love of God, who cannot be lost. The shared question is what allows a relationship to retain

significance after death. The resemblance is limited to refusing to treat absence as the ending of all meaning. Here it opens several ways of remembering without one outward proof. The boundary is that Stoic recollection and Christian love in God are not identical: the latter is not reduced to a psychological image, and the former proves no literal presence. No common theology is required of the reader.

6. **A future without guarantees — Seneca 63.15–16; Ecclesiastes 9:11–12.** Seneca rejects a fixed order of deaths by age and conditionally allows a future meeting; Ecclesiastes limits the link between skill and outcome and knowledge of one's hour. The shared question is how to choose when outcome and duration are unknown. The resemblance concerns the boundary of control, so a new journey need not become a happy conclusion to a history. The boundary is that Seneca's possible meeting proves no afterlife, while Ecclesiastes's earthly reflection predicts no particular event. Comparison preserves a choice's meaning without promising a favourable future.

Primary sources

1. **Augustine. Confessions, Book IV, chapters 4–9, §§ 7–14.** The selected chapters were read completely, including friendship context, loss, relocation, other friends, and love in God. The epigraph is a fragment of IV.4.9. The page credits J. G. Pilkington's translation, NPNF First Series, volume 1, edited by Philip Schaff, 1887; Kevin Knight revised the text for New Advent. Text and credits. This is Christian confessional reasoning, not diagnosis of the author or a universal judgement of others' faith.

2. **Seneca. Moral Letters to Lucilius, Letter 63, §§ 1–16.** The complete letter was read in this batch, then reopened for the memory question; adopted passages are 63.3–11 and 14–16, with the key quotation from 63.7. Richard M. Gummere's translation; the transcription's title identifies the volume's printing in 1918 and reprinting in 1925. Letter; title. Mourning deadlines, prescribed pleasant feeling, and the language of replacing a friend are not adopted as requirements.

3. **Ecclesiastes, chapter 9, King James Version.** All eighteen verses were read; the adopted passage is 9:1–12, especially 5–10 and 11–12. Chapter. Matthew Henry's adjacent commentary is not used as an article primary source. The perspective under the sun and God-given portion remain; compulsory joy and knowledge of an afterlife are not deduced.

Russian quotations are United Wisdom translations of the named English editions; English fragments were checked literally. No Latin or Hebrew original reading is claimed. Scenes, distinctions, and cautious practical questions are original reflection without a study of their therapeutic effects. No worldwide licence or permission for complete copying and raw-source ingestion is asserted.

Tags

memory, loss, grief, relationships, continuing life, loyalty, choice, future, past, recollection, objects, habits, friendship, irreplaceability, consent, boundaries, gratitude, family memory, history, change, Augustine, Seneca, Ecclesiastes, Stoicism, Christianity, biblical wisdom, finitude, imagined scenes, autonomy, reflection

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.