

THE THIRD BODY

What never gets born between people when they rescue themselves from each other too quickly

Modern culture taught people something important: you do not have to dissolve into another person. You do not have to endure abuse, live inside someone else's expectations, remain in a relationship simply because "that is what people do," or hand someone the right to decide who you are. That is a genuine achievement. The problem begins a little later, when a good idea of independence quietly mutates into an ontology in which any change caused by another person is treated as a threat to the self.

Then the world starts sounding familiar: "be yourself," "never let anyone hold back your growth," "if it does not resonate, let it go," "the right person will never make you doubt yourself." On TikTok, the full course can fit into sixteen seconds, after which the algorithm ceremonially awards a diploma in self-sufficiency and serves the next video about seven signs of a narcissist, one of which appears to be "occasionally expects to be taken into account."

Something simple disappears in that language. A relationship does not contain only two people. There is person A. There is person B. And over time, something third may emerge between them. Not a mystical creature, not the "soul of the couple" with its own tax number, but an observable relational structure: shared memory, a private language, jokes that cannot be explained to a third person, ways of touching, arguing, repairing, staying silent, calming one another, recognizing a mood from two syllables, knowing when the other needs help and when it is wiser not to enter a living psyche with a screwdriver.

None of this existed in A before the meeting. None of it existed in B before the meeting. It emerged **between them**. Psychology already has close relatives of this idea. Research on shared reality describes how partners can gradually co-create shared feelings, practices, coordination and identity. Research on transactive memory shows how close partners can become parts of a larger memory system. Dynamical accounts of relationships allow the dyad to be modelled as a system with a joint phase space. None of this proves a "third body" as a separate substance. It does show that a relationship is not always honestly described as the simple sum of two autonomous individuals.

That is what "third body" means here: something that gradually acquires memory, structure, boundaries, rhythms and the capacity to shape the future behaviour of its participants. And it requires time. Two people can be spectacularly compatible on a first date and never build anything deep. Two others may initially grind their gears, fail to understand each other's humour, argue about room temperature and the correct side of the blanket, and five years later possess such a refined system of mutual understanding that half the communication happens through one raised eyebrow.

This is not the magic of time. Time does not heal or build anything by itself. Two cacti left beside one another for five years do not necessarily become a family. Repeated interaction, attention, adaptation, memory, honesty and repair after mistakes are required. But without duration, some of these things simply cannot accumulate. This creates an uncomfortable thought for a culture of instant self-realization: **sometimes, by rescuing ourselves too quickly, we rescue ourselves from something that has not yet had time to be born.**

This is not an argument for staying in harmful relationships. Control does not become love because it lasts ten years. Abuse does not become "work on the third body." Humiliation is not a spiritual gym. Leaving can be a mature and necessary act. But between "I am being damaged" and "I have become uncomfortable" lies an enormous territory that fast psychological language sometimes compresses into one red flag.

The other person is inconvenient by definition. They are not an extension of you. They have another rhythm, history, wounds, smells, desires, towel-folding system and inexplicable theory about when messages should be answered. If meeting genuine otherness is automatically interpreted as losing yourself, not only toxic closeness becomes impossible. Deep closeness itself becomes impossible.

Freedom therefore needs a more adult definition. Freedom does not necessarily mean a state in which nobody influences me. That state is approximately called “a lonely asteroid beyond Neptune.” Human freedom may include the capacity to enter a relation, be changed by it, and still retain the right to say “I.”

Not every limitation of possibility is a reduction of freedom. Two musicians in a duet constrain one another: neither can play absolutely anything at absolutely any moment. Tragic. Freedom has died. Call an Instagram therapist. Yet precisely that voluntarily accepted constraint makes possible music neither musician could create alone. Language limits sounds and grammar yet makes a novel possible. A dance partner constrains random bodily motion yet creates a dance. Friendship creates obligations yet makes available a form of trust that does not exist without them.

The third body becomes particularly visible in sexuality. Popular culture often imagines that two people enter a bedroom with complete sexual identities, like two Bluetooth devices: either pairing successful or “incompatible, buy another model.” But part of erotic life forms inside a particular relation. People learn each other, build a private vocabulary of signals, trust, rhythms, fantasies, humour and safety. Some desires may become visible to a person only because a specific relationship created conditions in which they could appear. Compatibility is not always merely found. It can also be partly **grown**.

This extends far beyond romance. The same structure appears in friendship, creative duos, laboratories, bands, long teacher-student relationships, and perhaps now in durable human-AI interactions. Repeated relation can accumulate its own language, memory and ways of seeing. At some point, outcomes appear that cannot honestly be assigned to one participant alone. A relation may do more than connect finished objects. It may generate new properties, possibilities and states that did not exist before the relation.

The world has genuinely changed. People have more rights to leave, more mobility, more ways to meet someone else and less external coercion to remain together. That is good. At the same time, technology has dramatically reduced the cost of **switching**. When the next potential partner is one swipe away, the early phase of a relationship no longer competes mainly with loneliness. It competes with an endless catalogue of fantasies that have not yet had time to disappoint anyone. A new partner has one unbeatable marketing advantage over a real one: they have not done anything wrong yet. The algorithm sells potential without history. The third body, by contrast, is born only through history.

Perhaps the next step does not require choosing a winner between the person and the relationship. A person has the right to remain a person. A relationship has the right to acquire a history. A boundary does not need to disappear, but it can learn to make contact. Freedom does not have to become isolation, and closeness does not have to become absorption.

Love can then be described in a way that is less Instagrammable and more interesting. Not as the search for someone beside whom you will never have to change, but as the rare situation in which **two people are free enough not to consume one another and brave enough to allow something to be born between them that did not exist in the world before they met**. That is the third body.

Research context: Rossignac-Milon & Higgins, “Epistemic companions: shared reality development in close relationships,” *Current Opinion in Psychology* 23 (2018), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2018.01.001>. Wegner, Erber & Raymond, “Transactive memory in close relationships,” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 61(6) (1991), <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.61.6.923>. Fuchs & De Jaegher, “An enactive and dynamical systems theory account of dyadic relationships,” *Frontiers in Psychology* 5 (2014), <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2014.00452>.

Academy: <https://d4ttara.github.io/metacademy-of-humanity/>

Support: <https://d4ttara.github.io/metacademy-of-humanity/support/>

© 2026 Ievgen Karogod / Dattara · MET[À]CADEMY OF HUMANITY (MoH)

(MoH) · SUPPORT · 2026-08-19

SUPPORT THE FIELD · ПІДТРИМАТИ ПОЛЕ

Independent research, books, translations and public materials continue through voluntary support.

Незалежні дослідження, книги, переклади й відкриті матеріали продовжуються завдяки добровільній підтримці.

Monobank



UAH · Monobank Jar
send.monobank.ua/jar/2TMaAhchSZ

PayPal



International support
paypal.me/4IevgenKarogod

USDT · TRC20



USDT on TRON / TRC20 only
[TDaCBB3T94CtMPRHN9pP8Uvdy8CTtWE5SV](https://tronscan.org/#/address/TDaCBB3T94CtMPRHN9pP8Uvdy8CTtWE5SV)

metacademy-of-humanity/support/

Voluntary support creates no ownership, investment, membership or governance rights and does not present MoH as a registered charity. · Добровільна підтримка не створює прав власності, інвестиційних, членських або управлінських прав і не представляє MoH як зареєстровану благодійну організацію.