

UNITED WISDOM

What Feelings Tell Us—and What They Do Not Prove

The Person and Inner Life

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

I11 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

What Feelings Tell Us—and What They Do Not Prove

Epigraph

> *“You are but an appearance, and not absolutely the thing you appear to be.”*

Epictetus, *Enchiridion*, §1, translated by Elizabeth Carter. Edition text.

What this article is about

Imagine an ordinary evening: a message has been read, there is no reply, and a brief silence already feels like rejection. The pain is real. Yet between that pain and the conclusion “I do not matter to this person” lies a distance that the strength of a feeling cannot bridge. It contains information about the situation, previous expectations, the circumstances of today, and another person's unknown motives. This article explores that distance. It does not ask you to distrust yourself or prove your right to every feeling. It considers how to retain what a feeling tells you without turning the first explanation into a verdict. Stoic reflection on impressions, Buddhist attention to sustained hostility, religious expressions of grief, and research on mood address different questions. Their limited comparison reveals a useful possibility: acknowledge experience now, while gradually clarifying its object, cause, and implications. The outcome may be a firm boundary, a question, or an honest “I do not know yet.”

I. Experience and explanation belong to different levels

A feeling tells us how a person experiences an event now. It does not certify the truth of the entire account of that event. In the hypothetical messaging scene, “I feel anxious while waiting for a reply” describes one's own state; “I am being deliberately ignored” adds another person's intention. These statements cannot be checked in the same way. The second requires further circumstances: what was promised, how long the silence has lasted, whether the other person is available, whether this has happened before, and what explanations they previously offered. Distinguishing these levels does not automatically reduce anxiety, but it can prevent an unnecessary accusation.

Errors are possible in both directions. One is to mistake the strength of an experience for the strength of the evidence. Another is to decide that a doubtful explanation invalidates the experience itself. If we later discover that the phone battery died, the evening's anxiety does not become a lie. Its causal story changes. The person really waited, imagined an unwelcome outcome, and experienced uncertainty. New information corrects the picture of someone else;

it does not retrospectively prohibit one's own experience. This distinction makes changing one's mind possible without the humiliating conclusion that one has once again proved defective.

In the *Enchiridion*, §1, Epictetus proposes examining an impression before assenting to it. This is a philosophical discipline with its own ideal of freedom, not research into messaging. We borrow a limited distinction for the contemporary scene: what appears in consciousness still warrants consideration. We do not impose the entire Stoic ideal on the reader or require immediate composure. The possibility of revising a judgment does not mean complete control over the emergence of a feeling.

It can help to keep two sentences instead of one: “This silence upsets me. I explain it as a lack of interest, but I do not know that yet.” Such language may be awkward in a heated conversation, but it is more precise. It preserves both an internal reality and an open question about the external one. That creates room for a next action that does not require definitive knowledge of someone else's character.

II. A feeling draws attention without decoding its meaning

When something affects us, we have a reason to pay attention. Attention, however, is not a ready-made translation from emotion into need. Irritation may arise around an unagreed deadline, a rude remark, a cramped room, or several burdens at once. It does not follow that every irritation signifies a violated boundary, or every anxiety a lack of safety. Such dictionaries seem clear because they remove uncertainty. They may also remove the very part of a situation that needs understanding.

Suppose someone becomes angry after receiving friendly advice. Different questions are possible. Was the advice unsolicited? Did it touch a painful subject? Was it inaccurate? Did it demand a decision that is currently impossible? Did it recall a conversation in which the person was not heard? Several answers may be true together. None emerges automatically from the word “anger.” Assigning a single need in advance may bypass a concrete mistake, an actual shortage of time, or disagreement with the advice itself. Understanding the feeling means exploring the episode, rather than choosing an attractive decoding of it.

In *Nicomachean Ethics*, II.6, Aristotle considers feelings through their circumstances, objects, people, timing, and manner. His question is normative: what constitutes appropriate feeling and action within a good life? He does not supply a table of hidden needs. For our purpose, another point matters: even within one philosophy, the name of a feeling is insufficient for evaluation. Details are needed. Contemporary readers need not accept Aristotle's entire ideal of character to retain attention to circumstances as a useful descriptive habit.

Sometimes a feeling's most accurate message is modest: “This conversation matters to me and is difficult.” That is already information if it helps someone choose a pace, avoid promising too much, or request clarification. It need not immediately become knowledge about childhood, relationships, or personality. An open description allows meaning to emerge gradually. Meanwhile, personal importance and the fairness of a demand remain different questions: we may urgently want an answer that another person is not obliged to provide immediately.

III. Mood can enter an answer to a different question

Sometimes we ask ourselves about work, relationships, or life, and answer partly through the state of the present hour. That does not mean the assessment is always wrong. It means its grounds deserve examination. Imagine a morning after an unpleasant conversation: a familiar task seems meaningless, colleagues cold, plans hopeless. By evening, more specific explanations emerge. The workload may really be excessive, while the conclusion “everything is pointless” covered more than the information justified. The internal state and the assessment of its object became closely intertwined.

In their 2003 author review, Norbert Schwarz and Gerald Clore discuss how mood serves as information and how its attributed cause changes its influence on judgment. They revisit their own 1983 experiments, including life-satisfaction judgments and reminders about the weather. The relevant research question concerns attribution: what someone believes accounts for their state. The review is not a new experiment and does not establish the cause of any particular everyday decision.

Applying this to our example is the authors' reflection: before making a sweeping assessment, it may help to ask which time and object the feeling concerns. What happened today? What has persisted for months? Which working conditions remain poor on a calm day? If irritation declines after rest, that does not prove the job is good. If it remains, that does not prove the job is bad. Only part of the available observations has changed. A decision still requires the task's content, actual deadlines, opportunities to alter the workload, and the cost of continuing.

It is especially easy to confuse mood with definitive knowledge when a question is too broad: “What is my life like?” A single answer must combine unlike domains. We can narrow the question to something examinable: “What needs to change in the coming week?” The feeling does not disappear, but becomes one participant in consideration, alongside facts and constraints. This shift cannot guarantee a good decision. It makes visible which part of the answer was a generalization and which still needs checking.

IV. A bodily sensation does not identify a culprit

The bodily aspect of experience can make an explanation feel particularly convincing. A tight throat, heat, tense shoulders: surely, one thinks, I have correctly detected danger or someone else's hostility. Yet the sensation and its explanation are different again. We may reliably say that a conversation is accompanied by tension. From tension alone, we cannot establish the other person's intention, the moral value of a decision, or the precise origin of the response. The body participates in experience; it need not deliver a ready verbal answer about causes.

In a hypothetical example, someone notices tension before meeting their manager. A discussion of deadlines is scheduled, several tasks remain unfinished, and criticism is expected. The bodily response establishes neither “I am about to be humiliated” nor “this is all in my head.” The meeting may have real consequences, while anticipation exaggerates some of them. Separating the layers does not mean choosing an optimistic explanation in advance. It leaves room for documents, earlier conversations, prepared questions, and one's state before the meeting.

A limited ethical parallel can help here, rather than a physiological explanation. In the *Dhammapada*, verses 3–5, translated by F. Max Müller, an experienced insult and sustained hostility are distinguished. The religious text does not establish that no insult occurred; it considers the continuation of hostility. This is neither an account of bodily mechanisms nor a contemporary model of emotion. We can borrow a question about one's subsequent relationship to an event while preserving the religious context and avoiding blame when someone's body or experience fails to change on command.

The limited contemporary analogy is distinguishing sensation from an added account: “I find this meeting difficult to endure” and “I will certainly be harmed.” The account may be true, false, or partly true. Observing bodily experience does not decide this in advance. Moreover, when circumstances call for immediate protection, we need not await a definitive interpretation. We can leave a conversation or change its conditions while retaining as unknown what cannot yet be established.

V. Acknowledgment need not confirm an accusation

In conversation, acknowledging a feeling and confirming its cause are often linked so closely that we appear forced to choose between agreement and a cold argument. A third form is possible. When a friend says, “It hurts because they think I am worthless,” we can respond: “I hear that this hurts. What exactly was said?” The first sentence acknowledges the reported experience; the second clarifies the grounds for the conclusion. This is not a courtroom interrogation. Interest in facts should not sound like a demand to earn care through persuasive evidence.

Imagine an argument between two close people. One experienced a canceled meeting as evidence of being unwanted; the other explains it through an unexpected obligation. Both may find the situation difficult. Acknowledging this does not validate every way of expressing pain. Demanding constant explanations, reading private messages, or publicly humiliating someone remain separate actions with consequences. Emotional reality does not remove questions of consent, responsibility, and another person's dignity. Compassion becomes more precise when it does not promise to confirm every conclusion someone draws.

Religious language also allows experience without making it an external accusation. In the Quran, 12:86, Yaqub's complaint of sorrow is addressed to God. It belongs to a particular account of Yusuf, rather than a secular communication protocol. We do not derive an obligation to remain silent before other people, or claim that addressing God establishes the facts of a situation. The comparison concerns the possibility of expressing grief within a relationship without turning expression into an exhaustive explanation of everything that happened.

In a human conversation, we can ask what kind of response is needed now: listening, clarification of the episode, thinking together about action, or time. The speaker retains the right not to examine causes immediately. The listener retains the right not to confirm an unknown third party's motive. These freedoms are compatible. Sometimes the most useful response does not resolve the issue; it creates space to revise the account later without losing trust or having to renounce the feeling itself.

VI. A mistaken cause does not erase harm

The distinction between feeling and explanation can readily become a convenient escape from responsibility: “That is merely your perception, so I did nothing.” This is a logical leap. An unknown motive does not cancel an observable act. If an agreed deadline was missed, a message contained a humiliating phrase, or information was disclosed without consent, these actions can be discussed independently of their cause. Intention matters for some assessments, but it is not the only ground for addressing consequences.

In a hypothetical workplace scene, a colleague promised material by Friday and did not send it. Another person becomes anxious, then thinks: “He wants to set me up.” That thought requires checking. The absence of material by the deadline may already be established. There is no need to choose between a personal accusation and abandoning the demand entirely. We can name what happened, its consequences, and the response the task needs. This language can be firmer than accusation because its grounds do not depend on knowing someone else's thoughts.

Stoic attention to judgment therefore cannot serve as a universal justification of the environment. In §5 of the *Enchiridion*, Epictetus offers a stronger philosophical position on the role of impressions in distress than this article's limited editorial claim. We retain a distance: interpretation's involvement does not prove the absence of real harm, material dependence, or unequal opportunities. The contemporary conclusion is deliberately narrower than the ancient text. It does not require a harmed person to explain every feeling through mistaken thinking.

When the facts justify a boundary, we can establish it without a final account of another person's character. “I will not continue a conversation in this tone” differs from “You have always wanted to destroy me.” The first states conditions of participation; the second asserts motive and history. Part of the second may eventually be confirmed. Yet that confirmation is not always necessary for an available protective action. Precision retains the right to act, rather than turning uncertainty into an endless wait for the complete picture.

VII. A pause changes the order of consideration, not the duty to feel

A pause helps when it prevents the first interpretation from becoming an immediate, irreversible action. It cannot be judged solely by whether someone became calm. We can take time and remain angry. We can calm down and still recognize a serious violation. We can learn more and become more upset. The purpose of a pause is an opportunity to change the order: preserve safety and information, check the explanation, then choose an action. This is a suggestion for suitable circumstances, not a universal requirement for every conflict.

Suppose an email seems insulting. A long reply is already drafted and someone wants to send it to everyone involved. An available pause may consist of saving the draft, rereading the original email, and reconsidering the recipients, rather than performing a calming exercise. Which words are actually present? Which part of the reply concerns this email, and which earlier arguments? What will a broad distribution change? These questions do not forbid indignation; they reveal additional harm that the manner of responding could create.

In Seneca's *Of Anger*, II.1–4, an initial involuntary movement is separated from subsequent assent and the desire for revenge. Stoic terminology differs from the ordinary contemporary word “anger,” so the text does not prove that everyone freely chooses each emotion. For our subject, the relevant possibility is distinguishing an emerging impression from its development into intention. In actual circumstances, this possibility has limits: people do not have equal time, strength, and available actions.

A pause also needs an honest ending. If someone says “I will return tomorrow,” disappearing indefinitely becomes a new event. We can specify a time, the possibility of an extension, and the form of the next contact. Sometimes a pause is inappropriate: an urgent task needs an

answer or a dangerous action needs stopping. Distinguishing the levels may then take one sentence: “I am very angry, but right now I am addressing safety.” The entire internal analysis need not be completed before any action.

VIII. Mature trust leaves room for correction

Trusting one's experience need not mean treating every explanation as final. It may involve a harder willingness: taking internal experience seriously while allowing clarification. In a hypothetical scene, someone initially thinks they were deliberately excluded from a meeting. Later, a calendar error is discovered. They can revise the assessment of intention while retaining a discussion of why the missing invitation had consequences. Correction does not force a choice between accusing everyone and distrusting everything within oneself.

Symmetry matters. When new information confirms a violation, it should also be accepted, even if we initially wanted to explain everything through fatigue or misunderstanding. Examining a feeling should not work in favor of reconciliation in advance. Its task is to improve the picture, not produce a predetermined relationship. Sometimes precision means acknowledging that a promise was broken and further participation requires different conditions. Sometimes it means understanding that an action lacks its attributed significance. Either outcome is compatible with self-respect.

This article's different sources meet at one limited point. Epictetus proposes examining an impression; the *Dhammapada* distinguishes experienced insult from sustained hostility; Aristotle returns assessment to circumstances; mood research asks about the attributed source of a state. They do not form a unified scientific theory or promise a common outcome. Each line has its own question, language, and criterion. Comparison helps reveal layers; it does not prove that those layers operate identically across all cultures.

A human difficulty remains: admitting an error often sounds like defeat. It helps to change both the conclusion and the form of revision. “I have new information” is more accurate than “I cannot be trusted at all.” “I decided too early that I knew the motive” is more specific than “I always overdramatize.” The less correction becomes a verdict on personality, the easier it is to retain the feeling's actual message. It can take its place in the next decision without occupying the place of every fact at once.

IX. A pleasant feeling does not certify an explanation either

Caution is needed beyond anxiety and anger. Relief, enthusiasm, and closeness can also accompany explanations that remain unchecked. Imagine a conversation in which someone promises a quick solution to a longstanding difficulty. For the first time in a while, the listener feels hope. That experience matters, but it does not confirm the speaker's competence, the plan's feasibility, or the alignment of interests. The pleasantness of a response and its reliability belong to different aspects of the situation. We can treat hope carefully while asking about deadlines, conditions, and consequences.

Another hypothetical example is deciding to end a difficult conversation. Relief comes immediately. It reports a changed internal state but does not, by itself, prove that the relationship should end permanently. The person may need distance; the conversation may really have been unacceptable; perhaps only today's overload has been addressed. The next choice requires information absent from the relief itself. Relief can be a useful signal about the cost of participation without having to know the entire path ahead.

The same precision applies to inspiration after reading. If a philosophical idea brings clarity, this does not establish its universal truth. We can identify what became clearer: an expectation was distinguished from a promise, a new formulation emerged, an available action became visible. An idea's practical value is better examined through a particular application and its consequences. The confidence with which an elegant explanation reads cannot replace that examination. Otherwise, a pleasant internal response quietly becomes an external certificate of quality.

There is no need to suspect every good moment. Joy can remain joy without an investigation. Further consideration is appropriate when a feeling is used to support a consequential decision or claim about another person. A calm question then becomes possible: besides this pleasant impression, what supports the conclusion? Trust in a good experience need not become credulity toward every story accompanying it.

X. Agreement broadens the picture without completing the inquiry

Similar experiences may support someone, but several identical reactions do not necessarily establish one cause. In a hypothetical team, three people felt tense after a meeting. That is a reason to discuss its conditions carefully. Shared tension does not yet show that the manager deliberately humiliated everyone. People may have heard different remarks, anticipated different consequences, and influenced one another afterward. Their accounts belong in the picture; each also needs its own context.

It helps to distinguish testimony from agreement with an interpretation. “I heard that phrase too” adds an observation. “I also think we are not respected” adds an opinion. “I had a headache after the meeting” adds a bodily self-report. Each may matter, but their evidential roles differ. Mixing them makes the number of people agreeing replace examination of the event. Discarding them altogether removes an opportunity to identify a recurring condition or harm that one participant struggled to name.

A conversation can allow people not to match. One describes what was unacceptable; another what remained unclear; a third experienced no strong feeling but noticed an agreement being violated. Difference need not undermine mutual support. It helps prevent an emotional reaction from becoming a compulsory admission ticket to discussing a problem. A calm witness can report an important fact; a deeply affected person can still be mistaken about one detail.

For a shared assessment, preserving exact words, roles, and sequence is especially useful, followed by a separate discussion of action. A joint letter about unagreed deadlines may be justified without a shared verdict on the manager's personality. If a specific humiliation is identified, it can be named specifically. Collective consideration should give a situation more independent grounds, rather than make its first explanation inviolable through the force of shared emotion.

What this means in practice

For one manageable episode, you can write four lines. First: what happened in a form that can be clarified. Second: what I experience now, in my own words. Third: how I explain what happened and what I do not yet know. Fourth: what action is available without definitive knowledge of someone else's motive. This is an authors' form of orientation, not a test, diagnosis, or promise of feeling better. It can be shortened to two lines or left incomplete when detailed reflection is too difficult now.

In a hypothetical example, the first line reads: “The material did not arrive by the agreed time.” The second: “I feel anxious and angry.” The third: “It seems that I am being disregarded; the reason for the delay is unknown.” The fourth: “I will clarify the deadline and explain that I cannot complete my part without the material.” Here the feeling is neither erased nor converted into evidence of intention. The person nevertheless takes a meaningful action related to the task and its consequences. If the response supports another explanation, the record can be updated.

You need not find the correct name for every shade of feeling. Sometimes distinguishing unpleasantness, tension, a desire to leave, and an unknown object of experience is enough. You need not collect information indefinitely before establishing a boundary or continue a conversation for the sake of perfect analysis. What matters is not representing one layer as all

the others. After acting, notice a concrete result: did new information appear, conditions change, uncertainty decline, or another difficulty emerge? Usefulness depends on that observation, rather than the elegance of the completed lines.

Key quotation

> *“I complain of my anguish and sorrow only to Allah”.*

Quran, 12:86, the beginning of Mustafa Khattab's *The Clear Quran* translation. The verse within the account of Yusuf. The complaint is named; it is not a universal explanation of a feeling's causes or an instruction to refuse human help.

Connections between traditions

Comparison	Actual similarity	Limit of the comparison
Epictetus ↔ research on mood attribution	An emerging state can be distinguished from an accepted judgment.	Stoic discipline is not an experimental model of mood.
Dhammapada, 3–5 ↔ one's subsequent relationship to an event	Experienced insult can be distinguished from sustained hostility.	This is an ethical parallel, not an explanation of bodily mechanisms or a denial of harm.
Aristotle ↔ examination of a particular episode	Objects, timing, conditions, and action matter for assessment.	Virtue ethics does not supply a universal table of needs.
Yaqub in the Quran ↔ acknowledging experience	Sorrow can be expressed without exhausting the account of its causes.	Addressing God is not identical to secular conversation or fact-checking.
Seneca ↔ a pause before responding	An initial movement differs from subsequent intention.	The Stoic definition of anger differs from the contemporary everyday emotion.

Primary sources and research

• Epictetus. *Enchiridion*, §§1, 5, 20; translated by Elizabeth Carter. Impression, assent, and the limits of philosophical application.

• Aristotle. *Nicomachean Ethics*, II.6, II.9; translated by W. D. Ross. Circumstances of feeling and assessment of action.

• *Dhammapada*, 3–5. F. Max Müller's translation, *Sacred Books of the East*, X; Gutenberg electronic edition no. 2017. Insult and the continuation of hostility; not a physiological model.

• Schwarz, N.; Clore, G. L. *Mood as Information: 20 Years Later*. Psychological Inquiry 14, 296–303, 2003. The authors' review of their research approach, not a new experiment.

• Quran, 12:86. *The Clear Quran*, Mustafa Khattab. Yaqub's complaint within the account of Yusuf.

• Seneca. *Of Anger*, II.1–4; translated by Aubrey Stewart. Involuntary movement, assent, and subsequent intention.

Tags

feelings, experience, emotions, interpretation, fact, causation, attribution, mood, anxiety, anger, sorrow, expectation, uncertainty, message, relationships, boundaries, consent, responsibility, bodily sensation, impression, Epictetus, Aristotle, Seneca, Buddhism, Dhammapada, Quran, Yaqub, pause, revision, orientation

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 coauthor 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.