

UNITED WISDOM

Belonging to several places: living without one final answer about where I am at home

Relationships and Intimacy

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

R-22-N05 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Belonging to several places: living without one final answer about where I am at home

Epigraph

> *I belong on a farm.*

Willa Cather, *My Ántonia*, Book V, Chapter I, Ántonia's words about her present life. One short complete sentence within her response. A fictional character's voice rather than a universal choice for an emigrant. Text.

What this article is about

Consider Pavel, who lives in one city, grew up in another, and spent several years in a third. His present place holds work and a familiar route; his childhood city holds people and the language of memory; the third holds experience he does not want to erase as a mistake. Asked where he belongs now, Pavel tries to select one answer, as though his other connections make him unreliable. The characters and scenes are fictional. They offer a subject for reflection rather than a researched personal case.

How can several meaningful places be acknowledged without promising equal closeness, constant availability, and loyalty to everyone's expectations? Here belonging means an experienced connection and particular participation; legal status and citizenship require other foundations. We consider memory, present daily life, others' recognition, and participation's cost. The primary references are a selected conversation in Cather, He, Mao, and Kinoshita's 2023 research, and Chapter V of the *Epistle to Diognetus*. Their differences remain. Our voluntary small map guarantees neither acceptance nor wholeness and establishes no legal right to reside, enter, or exercise authority over a place.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

I. Where I belong can require several different answers

In his current city, Pavel knows which shop opens late and how best to walk to work. In his childhood city, he need not explain an old joke. In the third place, he remembers a period of learning and particular meetings. These connections can all be real while being real in different senses. A familiar route does not mean complete acceptance by people. Shared memory does not guarantee present convenience. A cherished period does not establish the availability of return. If these properties merge into one word, belonging, every answer will appear incomplete and require excluding the other places.

The substance of a connection can be named before choosing an overall name, if one is needed at all. I live here; grew up there; learned something important elsewhere; remain in touch with particular people. This need not be a defensive speech. It communicates several facts without a final assessment of belonging. Pavel may later designate one place as primary or refrain from doing so. The article prescribes no multiplicity as the correct arrangement of personality. It simply preserves the right not to treat several meaningful connections as false because a question demands one brief choice.

Different answers can also have different degrees of publicity. A colleague only needs the current city; someone close is interested in earlier places; an official institution needs specified information under its actual rules. A general article cannot replace those requirements. Personal description cannot substitute for an accurate legal answer where one is needed. Everyday conversation, however, should not automatically demand that complete report. Pavel can disclose one part and keep another private without turning every question about home into an examination of documents, political loyalty, and his entire history of movement.

Not every unfinished answer means confusion requiring urgent removal. Pavel may understand the three connections clearly without a single name. Or he may really be uncertain. Neither state should be decided for him from a lengthy response. In our scene, it is more useful to ask which meaning is needed now: residence, memory, participation, or feeling. The question then becomes easier to answer. Inner unity need not be declared achieved. It is enough to avoid making an ambiguous place evidence that someone has not yet earned belonging anywhere and must first reject part of their life.

II. A connection with a new place need not be paid for by renouncing an earlier one

Pavel likes his present neighborhood. Sometimes this seems like betraying people far away. Affection for one place does not itself establish a break with another, however. He can value a new route and miss an old street, feel grateful for today's opportunity and regret the move's cost. These feelings can coexist. The article does not prove they will combine easily for everyone. It demands no equal happiness in different places. A pleasant present day simply need not become a mandatory declaration that everything earlier was worse and no longer matters.

An earlier connection should not prohibit present life either. Keeping memory does not require Pavel to prove it by refusing to learn a new city. Loyalty to people does not always require loyalty to every daily condition of their place. He can maintain conversation while changing his path, remember a language while using another, and value an old dish while trying something new. Particular promises have content requiring separate consideration, however. Our text cancels no accepted commitments with the general word freedom. It distinguishes memory from a definite agreement so that one does not automatically expand into someone's entire future life.

Sometimes a relative really wants Pavel to return. Their wish cannot be fully explained by the convenient label possessiveness. They may lack closeness and time together. Acknowledging that wish does not decide for Pavel, however. He may say he also misses them while not choosing to return now. The answer may cause pain. A boundary does not guarantee calm, but preserves the subject: a particular residential decision rather than an assessment of all love. Several cherished places offer no simple means of satisfying everyone who understands connection only through constant physical proximity.

This distinction does not establish that every earlier relationship must be preserved. Pavel wants some contacts to end; others have become unavailable. Multiple belonging is no obligation to keep every address as a sacred part of oneself. He can reconsider a connection without proving the place was wholly bad. A meaningful period can end. That change should be named honestly rather than presenting current participation that does not exist. The right to several places includes reducing active connections without an order to forget their history or turn every ending into a final defeat of one's capacity to belong.

III. Fictional certainty about one place does not erase another's value

In the selected conversation in *My Ántonia*, the heroine relates her present life to the farm, but challenges the narrator when he considers her earlier move to town unnecessary. She acknowledges what she acquired there. This is a fictional view of her history, not proof that every move is beneficial. We compare only valuing a present place without denying another period. Historical gender expectations and assessments of urban or rural people are not adopted as general norms. Book V, Chapter I.

Pavel can similarly consider his current city suitable without rewriting the third as failure. It was difficult, and important learning occurred there. Both statements have content. Difficult experience need not be designated a benefit afterward. A real cost can be acknowledged without mandatory gratitude for it. In our scene, the past stays distinguishable: what someone gained, lost, and no longer wants to repeat. Such a description needs no overall verdict on a place that would make today's choice the only possibility and thus wholly justified before every listener.

The novel's heroine has her own degree of certainty, which Pavel need not share. He need not find his own farm, a single point where doubt disappears. Literature prescribes no required outcome. It helps show that certainty about one place and acknowledgment of another need not exclude each other. A present decision can also remain temporary. That does not make a lived day fictitious. Naming an available connection and the actual duration of a decision, if there is one, matters more than borrowing a character's resolution when one's own life does not yet possess it.

A strong objection is that these distinctions allow someone to claim any convenient aspect as theirs without answering for a choice's consequences. Belonging therefore cannot be used to cancel a particular task. If Pavel promised involvement, the promise and its practicability need consideration. If he merely retains memory, that is another subject. Several places do not create automatic inconsistency, but neither release someone from honesty. Our text preserves a double limit: someone cannot be forced into a sole emotional address, while an emotional name should not hide an accepted commitment or claim access others never granted.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

IV. Research into two places is not a test of correct belonging

He, Mao, and Kinoshita studied attachment to a place of origin and a current or former place of residence among internal migrants and returnees from China's Shuangfeng County. They used an online questionnaire and non-probability snowball sampling. The abstract and methods give different sample sizes, so exact frequencies are not adopted here. We need only the framework for comparing two places. It represents neither all emigrants nor causality or a personal right to belong. Primary publication.

For Pavel, this is a reason not to make simultaneous connections impossible from the outset. The study does not say what he feels or allocate him to a type found by its authors. Our article offers no self-diagnostic questionnaire. His own relationships with places can be noticed separately without converting life into scores. Participation is available in his current city; memory matters elsewhere; a third produces mixed feelings. This describes an editorial scene rather than a measurement result. The statistical framework remains at its level, and a personal account does not confirm a scientific finding merely because it sounds similar.

Research into internal movement should especially not be transferred directly to international borders. Legal conditions, language, safety, and family history can differ. Conditional similarity in a question does not remove those differences. A reader may not recognize themselves in the selected context. They can then use another source or leave the research comparison aside. Our text does not promise scientific confirmation of their feeling. It shows one way to consider several objects of connection while retaining methodological limits. Pavel's history needs its own information, supplied on his behalf by neither a Chinese sample nor a literary conversation.

Research language need not become household vocabulary either. Pavel can speak of a place where breathing feels easier, a familiar street, or a cherished time. These expressions do not equal a questionnaire's indicator and need not be forced into one scientific category. A claim about a population, however, needs appropriate evidence. His experience should be distinguished from a general law. He can say two cities matter to him without concluding that everyone needs two affiliations. An adult's right to describe experience persists alongside limits on the scope of claims about others.

V. Others' recognition does not automatically coincide with a personal connection

Pavel has lived in his current neighborhood for years, but one person keeps calling him a newcomer. This may hurt. The word does not determine the entire connection with the place or communicate all neighbors' views, however. It may describe origin or express distance; its meaning needs consideration in the particular situation. The article proposes neither ignoring exclusion nor declaring every unpleasant response a misunderstanding. It simply does not assign one voice final authority to decide whether lived life here has meaning or someone can consider this city significant to themselves at all.

A personal connection does not create every form of access either. Pavel loves a park without becoming its sole owner. He remembers a schoolyard without being entitled to enter on any conditions. Calling a city his own does not eliminate the need to establish actual rules for particular actions. Legal and public arrangements are not established by an emotional word. This limit does not humiliate memory. It protects precision: an experienced connection can exist without a particular power. The right discussed here is ethical and concerns self-description; it grants no legal permission to reside, enter, participate, or control another's space.

Belonging can be recognized differently in different circles. An old friend considers Pavel one of their own, a present work group knows only his professional role, and neighbors recognize his face. These relationships need not combine into one assessment. He can want wider closeness without receiving it. The article does not promise that a good explanation will force acceptance. Available participation can be named without depicting an absent connection. When recognition is limited, its actual extent matters rather than an attractive overall title. Human dignity does not await every circle's complete agreement with Pavel's chosen name for his place.

Sometimes a dispute about belonging involves actual pressure. Someone is required publicly to renounce another place to obtain ordinary human regard. This should not be explained solely by insufficiently clear self-description. In our framework, it marks the limit of voluntary conversation. The practice demands no proof of loyalty under humiliation or threat. Concrete protection depends on actual circumstances and is not established here. Pavel can end the conversation. He need not obtain the listener's agreement before keeping a cherished connection with another city, or reveal his entire history for permission to consider his residence real.

VI. Theological citizenship is not a modern second passport

Chapter V of the *Epistle to Diognetus* describes Christians living amid ordinary civic arrangements while retaining a heavenly foundation of belonging. It is an apologetic theological text rather than a theory of migration documents or a psychological model. We compare participation in an earthly place with a foundation not exhausted by it. Polemical assessments of other religions in the surrounding text are not adopted. The selected image does not promise equal access to foreign lands and requires no nonreligious reader to call themselves a heavenly citizen. Chapter V and context.

Pavel may find a question here about what lets him retain himself in different places. An answer may be religious, moral, connected with people, or related to his own work. These foundations cannot be declared one identical teaching. The theological text retains a particular confession, and the editorial comparison a limited question. A reader may reject it entirely. Comparison helps when it makes differences visible rather than renaming every tradition contemporary freedom to travel. Several earthly addresses prove no spiritual maturity; one stable address demonstrates no lack of it and requires no change for a universal ideal of openness.

An inner foundation does not cancel material conditions. Pavel still needs available housing, work, a route, and intelligible information. The idea that the true home is within may appeal to him, but should not silence external loss. The article makes it no mandatory conclusion. Someone can retain moral support and urgently need a safe place to live. This is no lack of spirituality. A conditional comparison remains useful only while it avoids telling someone that lack of access is insignificant and their entire task is the correct attitude towards the state of their own soul.

External stability does not require one internal answer either. Pavel lives in one place for a long time while retaining several cherished histories. Another person moves often and feels connected only to one city. Our article ranks neither. Different forms of belonging are considered through life's content rather than the number of marks on a map. A theological tradition does not decorate such quantitative competition. We leave its own meaning intact and take only a limited opportunity to ask what besides an address determines participation, without prescribing an answer or promising it will remove every reader's alienation.

VII. Several places require choices about time rather than equal shares of a soul

Pavel has limited weekends. He cannot participate equally often in three cities' lives. This does not make a connection with the less-visited place false. Actual unavailability nevertheless has consequences for people who want to see him. Their request should not be declared insignificant because belonging is multiple. An immediate choice can be named: this month I can talk but do not promise a journey; I lack time for a particular task. A specific limit establishes no final ranking of cities, but communicates what others can actually rely on during the selected period.

Maintaining a connection sometimes becomes too costly. Constant messages, journeys, and participation in every event occupy time Pavel does not have. He can reduce availability without having to make one place foreign forever. Reduction should be distinguished from silently promising the previous level of involvement, however. A specific agreement needs separate consideration. The article establishes no means of cancelling legal obligations. In this everyday scene, multiplicity should not become an attractive explanation releasing someone from telling people that today's possibility of participation has changed and a former expectation is no longer confirmed.

Even distribution is not a mandatory condition of honesty. Pavel is more occupied with the present city where his day takes place. This may be a practical circumstance rather than a moral choice against the past. He can keep memory without daily action. Particular closeness, however, may require real meetings or conversations. Our text establishes that cost for no one. It proposes noticing one's wish and available form so that naming a connection does not replace participation itself. Someone can have several places while acknowledging that one connection currently exists primarily as memory rather than ongoing shared work.

Reconsideration also belongs to the person. Pavel may later choose one city, return, or discover a new meaningful place. That need not expose an earlier answer as a lie. Conditions and wishes change. Others may be hurt, and the article does not promise a painless transition. Accurate language only helps name what changed, without guaranteeing identical understanding. Multiple belonging should not become a fixed new identity to which someone must conform forever. The right to several places preserves the right to one, to uncertainty, and to a period when calling any address one's own is difficult.

VIII. Memory of a place grants no authority to speak for everyone living there

Pavel is sometimes asked to explain what people in his childhood city think. He knows particular families and his own experience, rather than the entire city. Belonging does not make him every resident's representative. He can speak for himself and identify the limit of his information. A current event requires an up-to-date source that memory cannot replace. This article establishes no population's political positions and proposes no such role for a reader. A cherished connection can remain personal without a duty to become a place's ambassador whenever others want one simple answer to a difficult public question.

Nor must every action in a place be defended to acknowledge it as one's own. Pavel can value a city and criticize a particular arrangement. He may lack enough information to assess it. Neither affection nor criticism automatically describes all loyalty. In our scene, belonging does not become mandatory agreement. A factual statement must still answer for its accuracy. Personal memory cannot prove everyone's present situation. Being able to avoid a sole emotional address does not cancel differences between experience, assessment, and information open to verification.

Another's curiosity can be kind while demanding speech that is too broad. Pavel need not explain an entire country over dinner. He can name one experience, clarify what he does not know, or decline discussion. This is not necessarily concealing belonging. An account needs to remain a chosen act rather than a fee for participation in a meeting. One answer does not sign up for subsequent lectures about every local tradition. A suitable independent source can be offered if known, but nobody needs to invent one or promise a final explanation merely to soften a refusal.

Pavel himself may also assess people in the new place too broadly from his first circle. The need to learn about them should not disappear behind a confident comparison with his former city. One space may contain different environments, relationships, and arrangements. This is no assertion of universal kindness. It limits generalization. A particular humiliating encounter can be named without a verdict on every resident; a kind one acknowledged without guaranteeing every future meeting. Belonging develops within distinguishable relationships. An attractive place name supplies no advance knowledge of every person's intentions when life will be shared nearby.

IX. Returning need not confirm that the past stayed still

Pavel visits his childhood city and finds a familiar shop closed, people busy, and an old route changed. This can produce alienation where immediate recognition was expected. Change does not cancel earlier life, however. The place continued existing without his constant presence. His connection grants no right to demand every object be preserved for a visit. He can grieve a loss without accusing the city of betrayal, and notice new participation if available. A visit need not end by fully restoring a feeling that previously arose under other conditions.

An old friend can recognize Pavel without having time for a long evening. That limit does not describe the entire friendship, but affects the present meeting. A city can remain his own in memory while becoming less convenient for today's life. These properties do not contradict one another. He need not choose between declaring home completely foreign and requiring former closeness to be felt. In our scene, it helps to learn what remains, what changed, and what is wanted now. The answer can be incomplete. Belonging undergoes no mandatory examination for identical experience after every visit and every alteration to a familiar street.

Returning sometimes strengthens a wish to stay. Sometimes it shows a present place fits better. The article predicts no outcome and recommends no journey as a test of a move's correctness. A route may be unavailable or too expensive. Significant decisions need actual conditions rather than impressions from one evening alone. Particular knowledge can be obtained without an immediate general conclusion. Pavel understands that he misses a certain person rather than the entire former arrangement of life; or discovers the opposite. These distinctions belong to his experience. Neither sources nor an editorial map should establish them in advance.

Belonging may also retain irreversible loss. Someone associated with a city has died; an earlier form of meeting is no longer possible. Our text offers neither a new address nor a correct attitude as compensation. Part of a connection can be acknowledged as memory that will not become present action. That does not make it unreal. Memory also requires no continuous pain to prove depth. Someone may sometimes forget a place and return to it differently. The article establishes no grief process and does not guarantee relief; it merely avoids making a missed former meeting a duty to cancel all significance of the period lived there.

X. Several places can remain different without forming one ideal home

At first, Pavel tried to select one answer for three connections. He can now name their substance. Today's life takes place in one city; another connects with people and memory; a third retains important experience. This is a possible outcome of a fictional scene, not a mandatory pattern for a reader. No place is assigned every property of home. Nor must Pavel call every address equally precious. Different connections persist without compulsory evenness, and accurately describing present participation does not prove he has finally found his place and will never feel foreign again.

The result can be small: answering one question without self-renunciation, noticing one promise's cost, or separating memory from an available journey. This guarantees neither wholeness nor recognition by others. Its significance needs checking in a particular conversation. If this language does not help, it can be left aside. The practice is voluntary, and nobody must prove maturity through the number of places they combine correctly. One cherished city is permissible. An incomplete answer is permissible. A period without clear belonging makes nobody less worthy or obliged immediately to manufacture an attractive map of their inner world.

Our sources retain different foundations. Ántonia assesses her history in fictional conversation. A research questionnaire compares two places among a particular group. A theological text describes earthly participation in relation to heavenly citizenship. None supplies universal permission for any residence or a general law of multiple identity. The editorial conclusion is narrower: several significant connections can be described separately without forcing one to cancel another. This is the article's ethical proposal, not discovered complete agreement among traditions. A reader can reject the comparison and retain a right to different language and another answer.

Where I belong remains a living question if it does not become a verdict. Pavel can answer differently today and in a year's time while considering real commitments to people. He need not declare three places one continuous homeland or choose a sole correct shore. Available honesty consists in naming a connection, action, and limit. Several places remain distinct and can matter differently. The right to such a history does not guarantee entry into every house, but prevents one casual question from acquiring the power to erase everything that does not fit its required short answer.

What this means in practice

If you wish, choose two meaningful places and name one real connection with each. It might be present daily life, a person, memory, work, or a wish. Then separately note what participation is available now and what is merely desired or unknown. You need not rank places or reveal your entire biography. Legal answers, documents, journeys, and authority over space require current foundations of their own; an emotional map cannot establish them.

Try one voluntary sentence on your own behalf: I live here, another place relates to a particular period, and I do not want to say more about a third. This is an example rather than a mandatory template. Keep accepted specific commitments visible without adding new ones to prove loyalty. Speak for no entire population. Stop under humiliation, threat, or demands for public renunciation; necessary protection and assistance do not await a successful explanation.

Later, a narrow result can be noticed: a meaning was named, a limit seen, or the lack of a suitable answer acknowledged. This is an editorial practice with no established effectiveness. Acceptance, feeling at home, wholeness, and preservation of connections are not guaranteed. One place, several, or an open question can be chosen. The small map only helps avoid merging memory, present life, and others' recognition into one demand that someone abandon part of what was lived before they may consider another part real.

Key quotation

> *I'm glad I went*

Willa Cather, *My Ántonia*, Book V, Chapter I. Ántonia challenges Jim Burden's view that her earlier move to town was unnecessary. The short sentence after the opening exclamation. It does not declare every move beneficial. Text.

Connections between traditions

Read reference	Limited similarity of question	Difference
Cather, V.I	Present place and the value of an earlier period	Fictional voice rather than a universal assessment of migration
He, Mao, Kinoshita (2023)	Two objects of attachment considered separately	Internal migration, non-probability sampling; sample sizes differ, frequencies not adopted
Epistle to Diognetus V	Earthly participation does not exhaust belonging's foundation	Christian heavenly citizenship rather than a passport or general psychological model

Sources

1. Willa Cather. My Ántonia, Book V, Chapter I; Gutenberg 242. Metadata, introduction, and selected V.I context were read, particularly the 1776–1783 conversation. The particular electronic version's print basis was not established. Fictional assessments are not assigned to Cather as biographical facts; territorial permission is not inferred from access.

2. Lei He, Yingming Mao, Takeshi Kinoshita. Place attachment among rural migrants and returnees: case of Shuangfeng County, China. Frontiers in Psychology 14:1279679, 28 November 2023. Metadata, methods, selected results/discussion/limits/conclusion, and CC BY license were read. The abstract's 274 differs from the methods' 287; exact size and frequencies are not transferred into the discussion. Raw data were not obtained.

3. The Epistle of Mathetes to Diognetus, Chapter V; New Advent. Translated by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, Ante-Nicene Fathers 1, 1885; edited by Kevin Knight. The selected chapter, theological and polemical surroundings, and version information were read. The Greek text was not compared; authorial attribution is not resolved here. Modern page rights UNKNOWN; no direct quotations.

Tags

emigration, belonging, several places, city, memory, home, present life, past, place of origin, attachment, participation, recognition, familiar, foreign, return, route, inner answer, independence, commitment, connection cost, time, others' expectations, personal description, limit, geography, Willa Cather, My Antonia, Antonia, Lei He, Yingming Mao, Takeshi Kinoshita, Epistle to Diognetus, heavenly citizenship, 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 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.