

UNITED WISDOM

Joy and Pleasure: What Do We Want to Keep?

The Person and the Inner World

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

I18 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Joy and Pleasure: What Do We Want to Keep?

Epigraph

> *“And Pleasure perfects the Working.”*

Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, book X, chapter IV in the English text read, Project Gutenberg no. 8438. A short original sentence; “perfects” concerns bringing an activity to fullness, rather than stopping it.

What this article is about

Imagine a successful evening. Good food, music, conversation, a long-awaited meeting. On the way home, you already want to decide exactly what was good. You would like to taste the dish again; keep a friend's passing remark in memory; continue, differently, the feeling that you are finally doing something of your own. All three responses can be called joy or pleasure, but the wishes behind them differ. Repeating a sensation, returning to a person, and preserving a direction in life are different tasks.

This article establishes no correct ranking of feelings. Pleasure is not declared inferior, and joy becomes no certificate of spiritual maturity. We consider what the experience concerns, the activity it accompanies, and what you want to keep afterward. Ancient ethics, Spinoza's philosophy, and the Gospel's language of joy help pose different questions; they do not form a single scientific theory of emotions. The right to enjoy something without earning it is discussed separately. Here the content of the good matters more than permission: when it consists in pleasantness, when in participation, and when those sides cannot honestly be separated.

I. Two words do not divide life into higher and lower

In ordinary conversation, the boundary moves. You can say a meeting brought pleasure and warm water after a difficult day brought joy. Someone else will exchange the words without changing the experience. Vocabulary should therefore not decide beforehand which feeling was authentic. The first clarification concerns the actual event rather than its label: what happened, what was pleasant, and why do you now want to return to it?

Imagine someone dismisses a favourite walk as “merely pleasure.” “Merely” already contains an assessment absent from the description. The walk may have included bodily pleasantness,

the place's beauty, conversation, and a welcome pause. No side destroys the others. Starting with a verdict on the experience's low level makes its content difficult to examine: its right to exist first needs defending.

The opposite judgment also creates an extra task. Calling an event true joy may lead to proving it sufficiently deep, pure, or selfless. A good dinner then needs philosophical justification, and fun an important life result. The article requires no such promotion. A good moment can be limited, mixed, and make no claim to the ultimate meaning of human existence.

For the discussion ahead, we use a working distinction. Pleasure will usually refer to pleasantness in participation or sensation; joy to a positive response to something that happened or is present as good for the person. These meanings overlap and are not clinical definitions. Their purpose is to make questions more precise, not correct the reader's speech. If your words work differently, actual content matters more than our provisional terminology.

Access to another person's experience also has a limit. A smile cannot reveal whether someone welcomes a meeting, feels relief, or tries to sustain conversation. An absence of smiling does not establish indifference to an event. We can ask and hear the answer without appropriating it beforehand. Distinguishing feelings starts with the person's right to name what mattered, including “I don't know yet.”

II. Pleasantness can belong to the activity itself

In book X, Aristotle considers pleasure in relation to activity, rather than merely as a reward added after work. In chapter IV, pleasure brings activity to fullness; different activities involve different pleasures. This belongs to his ethical philosophy, not a laboratory result or universal psychological rule. A limited direction of inquiry matters to us: what exactly is someone doing when they feel good?

Imagine a musician working through a difficult passage. Some attempts fail, yet the search for a sound is absorbing. Pleasure may concern hearing, movement, a solution found, or working together. It cannot be reduced to final praise. In this hypothetical scene, an important part of the good lies inside the activity, even though tiredness, irritation, and uncertainty are also present. Their presence does not cancel pleasant sides of participation.

In another case, someone prepares dinner, and pleasure comes specifically from the finished dish's taste. Work was necessary but did not become beloved. This is a legitimate description too. We need not find a calling in every action to recognise its value. Distinguishing pleasure in process from pleasure in outcome helps choose conditions: do you want to cook again, eat again, or share the table with the same people?

One evening can include several activities with unequal attractions. You love the music but find conversation tiring; enjoy the food but do not want to stay another two hours. “It was wonderful” hides these differences if used to plan the next gathering. Precision does not destroy gratitude. It preserves a successful part without making every condition an obligatory package for repetition.

Aristotle also discusses how pleasure in one activity can distract from another: a listener becomes absorbed in a flute's sound instead of the conversation. This is a philosophical example, not a modern measurement of attention. Our application is more cautious: in a particular scene, notice competing wishes and decide which participation matters now. Not every pleasantness simultaneously supports every activity, even when each has value separately.

III. Intensity does not determine value

A very strong sensation can easily look like the evening's main event. But strength and significance answer different questions. Loud music may occupy all attention; a friend's quiet sentence may change how a conversation is understood. We do not claim the quiet always runs deeper than the loud. Compare content rather than making arousal level a ready-made measure of what deserves a place in life.

Imagine two episodes: a spectacular ride and calmly returning to an activity after a long break. You would repeat the first for the impression and continue the second for the possibility of participating again. Neither must lose to the other. Asking only “Where was it stronger?” loses the difference between the tasks. You can want both an impression and a lasting pursuit without making them rivals for the only correct kind of good.

A recollection can also highlight the most striking part and leave accompanying things unnoticed. Here this is no claim about a memory mechanism but an invitation to examine your description. Having called a concert magnificent, consider whether the sound itself, the atmosphere, the person beside you, or finally stepping outside your usual schedule mattered. An immediate answer is unnecessary. Several grounds can remain together without being reduced to one.

Low intensity does not prove joy absent. You can welcome good news for someone close without overwhelming excitement. You can calmly see an important task completed. In this scene, an assessment of the event need not match public expressiveness. A person need not amplify their display to have participation judged sufficient; others also gain no right to establish feeling from the reaction's visible scale.

Quiet joy cannot be assigned from outside either. If someone says they felt nothing good, the article does not explain that joy existed deep inside anyway. Possibility and fact differ:

meaningful participation can be calm, but its actual presence is learned from the person's experience and words. An attractive description does not replace available evidence about a particular episode.

IV. What remains when the pleasant moment ends

After an event, you may want different continuations. To keep a sensation, relationships, knowledge, a skill, the possibility of returning to an activity. This is no hierarchy of goals: each has conditions. A dish's taste cannot be held continuously, but its recipe can be remembered. A meeting cannot literally be reproduced, but another conversation can be arranged. A chosen direction sometimes continues on days when it is entirely unpleasant.

Imagine someone participating in a shared project for the first time and feeling joy at finding a place. The following week brings boring organisational work. Pleasantness disappearing does not establish the first experience false. Initial joy, however, obliges no acceptance of every future condition. Look again at what remains: participation's meaning, respect, influence, an acceptable cost. A good start provides no indefinite guarantee.

If you only want to keep a particular sensation, name that without shame. We need not want relationships or development every time. In a hypothetical scene, someone chooses a short walk for sunshine and warmth without making it a life practice. Limited pleasure has an end. The next day may need something else without making today's walk a mistake or insufficiently deep.

A wish's content matters for joint decisions too. Friends try to repeat a restaurant evening: one wants the same taste, another free conversation, a third to see again the visitor who came that time. An identical invitation will not necessarily answer all three requests. Clarification helps more than requiring the former mood. Sometimes a valuable condition can be kept; sometimes the earlier event remains unrepeatable, and that needs acknowledging.

Naming the desired continuation more precisely places fewer promises on the next moment. Conversation may differ, familiar music fail to absorb, a beloved activity require effort. No possibility alone condemns the entire past. Value can be kept without demanding constant reproduction of one reaction; sometimes keeping means remembering, sometimes continuing, sometimes avoiding a forcible hold.

V. Spinoza complicates the familiar translation

Spinoza's *Ethics*, part III, proposition XI, note, describes a transition to greater fullness of existence; R. H. M. Elwes uses “pleasure” here. The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, section 2.4, explains that the corresponding affect is called joy and sometimes translated as pleasure. We will not make the difference between words a dispute over which language identified the true emotion. The specific translation and the author's meaning of transition need preserving.

“Greater perfection” belongs to Spinoza's philosophical system. It is no score for your success, moral purity, or health. It cannot measure a particular reader after a good evening. The question important to our comparison is limited: is the good experienced only as pleasant stimulation or also as a changed possibility of existing and acting? This is an editorial question beside the text, not an instrument the text supplies.

In a hypothetical scene, a change of schedule allows someone to draw again. Not only a particular line pleases them, but a recovered ability to act in an important sphere. The scene can cautiously be compared with the language of transition. It cannot be said to confirm Spinoza's entire metaphysics or describe a universal psychological process. Comparison helps insofar as it names actual content while retaining each foundation's limits.

The same philosopher, part IV, proposition XLV, note, distinguishes mockery from laughter and defends moderate enjoyment of food, music, and growing plants' beauty. Using him to justify contempt for bodily pleasantness is therefore inaccurate. Moderation and avoiding injury to one's neighbour remain in the text read. The author does not replace food's taste with an abstract feeling of elevated life; his list joins varied forms of participation.

The translation question teaches attentiveness to our own words. If pleasure means consumption alone, pleasant activity is excluded beforehand. If joy is permitted only as a high moral sign, its simple forms become suspicious. Instead of a final vocabulary, name the object, activity, and desired continuation each time. A source then expands description rather than forcing experience to meet one solemn definition.

VI. Joy for another does not appropriate their life

Pleasure and joy can concern an event in another person's life. In a hypothetical scene, a friend announces an opportunity to study something long desired. You welcome the news without receiving its material result. This shows that the good for us need not always match personal acquisition. We infer no universal mechanism of altruism; we consider the accessible content of one possible response.

Joy does not make their outcome our project. The person may change plans, tire of study, or encounter difficulties. If our support requires constant confirmation of a beautiful story, the friend gets extra work: preserving our excitement. Distinguish joy in their opportunity from a right to control it. The first can be sincere without creating the second or eliminating future uncertainty.

Shared pleasure does not mean complete agreement either. At a concert, one likes the melody, another the shared outing, a third the conversation afterward. An evening can be shared without sharing every preference. Allowing difference makes the event common without requiring identical inner reports. Nobody must call best the part that was best for another; attention to difference can preserve a particular connection.

In John 15:9–12, the language of full joy accompanies abiding in love and the commandment to love one another. This is Christian religious teaching in Jesus's speech, not a definition of pleasant mood. We preserve a limited intersection: the good is considered in relationships. Its foundation in faith and commandment differs from Aristotle's argument about activity and Spinoza's account of affect.

This passage cannot establish someone insufficiently loving because they feel no joy now. The article measures no spiritual level by mood. A religious reading is possible within the reader's own tradition without becoming a diagnosis or demand for immediate emotional fullness. Comparison retains distinct perspectives: fellowship matters, but a particular feeling delivers no final judgment on relationships, faith, or a capacity to care.

VII. A pause between the good and a demand to repeat it

After a successful moment, wanting repetition is natural in the ordinary sense: it is understandable to want again what was liked. Yet wish and obligation to repeat differ. If every pleasant episode immediately becomes a preservation project, new conditions appear: find the recipe, arrange the meeting, prove permanent availability. Sometimes that project fits; sometimes it obscures the event that has just ended.

Imagine someone sees beautiful light in a window and immediately seeks the perfect photograph. The image may provide extra pleasure. Or attention may now concern only whether the light can be held. This is a hypothetical scene, not criticism of photography or a law about immediacy disappearing. The question is specific: do you now want to look, photograph, share, or establish that the moment is not lost? Different decisions are possible.

Not every good thing must become a habit. A single meeting with a rare visitor can remain a separate event. A special taste requires no constant order. Keeping a memory does not mean ensuring repeatability. The acknowledgement can be sad: pleasant things end. We promise

neither easy relinquishment nor higher joy from it. It simply adds no impossible contract to what has already occurred.

Useful repetition exists too: a shared walk, favourite music, returning to an activity. The article does not oppose habit to living experience. What matters is whether changes in conditions and one's own wishes can still be noticed. What pleased before need not produce the former effect today. Cancelling a meeting may care for available energy rather than betray a relationship that once brought joy and still matters.

A pause allows asking what needs continuing and whether it needs continuing now. Sometimes the answer is arranging another conversation. Sometimes writing down a thought. Sometimes leaving the moment complete. The pause is no obligatory mindfulness technique or guarantee of a changed mood. It gives room for a decision between positive experience and a new demand we may quietly place on ourselves or someone beside us.

VIII. Pleasure's cost is not a moral verdict on it

Pleasantness alone describes no complete set of consequences. An evening can be good and cost sleep; a favourite activity require money or someone else's time. This is no reason to declare pleasure bad. See the actual cost and decide whether it is acceptable in these conditions. Real obligations, agreements, and possibilities matter rather than general shame that a person sometimes feels good at all.

Imagine wanting to stay at a celebration while important work awaits in the morning. Both wishes have content. Leaving does not prove joy absent; staying does not prove irresponsibility without knowing circumstances. Consider time, consequences, agreements, and alternatives. Feeling does not decide in the person's place, but responsibility need not deny the attraction of what must be declined.

A more serious boundary exists: pleasure in humiliating another does not justify humiliation. Participants' cheerful mood does not answer whether treatment is acceptable. Spinoza's distinction between laughter and mockery helps preserve this limit as a philosophical position. Our conclusion concerns responsibility for action rather than punishing someone for a response that arose. Stop the harm and examine the action without replacing it with an overall verdict on character.

Another person's discomfort does not automatically make our joy impermissible either. Someone may dislike our musical taste, resent our good fortune, or prefer silence. Distinguish actual harm, a broken agreement, and different preferences. Volume can be agreed without abandoning music altogether. Another's disappointment can be acknowledged without an obligation to cancel one's opportunity. Each scene needs facts rather than a single universal moral rule.

Cost makes the good part of actual life. It should not turn every cup of tea into an ethical examination. The inquiry's scale should fit the action: a short pleasant pause and a decision affecting others need different attention. An unknown cost can be clarified. If known and acceptable, constant retrial adds no information; sometimes the event can simply happen within the chosen limits.

IX. The good need not repair everything bad

A joyful episode gives no final answer to remaining difficulties. You can laugh during a hard period and still need help. You can enjoy food without calling your whole life fortunate. The combination requires no accusation of superficiality or pretence. Different parts of experience are considered; neither one moment's pleasantness nor its difficulty must become the only description of someone's entire life.

Imagine a meeting after an unpleasant workday. The conversation was truly enjoyable, yet the unresolved problem returns in the morning. This does not expose the evening as empty distraction. Its value may have consisted precisely in conversation and respite. The error would be promising that the gathering removed every consequence. Limited good requires no proof of finally overcoming the bad. Each retains its subject and scale.

Conversely, an absent pleasant response need not devalue an action. You may fulfil an important promise without joy. Care need not be enjoyable to be real. This does not justify enduring every exhaustion as elevated duty either. Both limits remain: feeling is not action's only criterion, and lasting difficult conditions need attention to actual capacities and support.

This article explains no medical causes of persistent loss of pleasure and offers no treatment. NHS lists loss of interest and enjoyment among possible symptoms needing assessment in context, rather than diagnosis from one sign. If changed feelings cause concern or interfere with life, appropriate professional help is an option, rather than extracting joy from philosophy as an obligation. No diagnosis is needed to recognise a text's limit. A disappointing evening and a lasting condition should not be confused; their circumstances need more precision than a general essay permits.

A limited good moment need not justify the whole world. Name it without concluding other problems exaggerated. Another person should also not receive “Just remember something pleasant” instead of a response to actual difficulty. Joy becomes part of life when speaking about the bad remains possible beside it, rather than joy becoming a condition that closes such conversation. This is an editorial limit of application, not a new theory of positive thinking.

X. Keep the content rather than commanding a feeling

Return to the evening we began with. Distinguish taste, music, a friend's presence, and the opportunity to do something of your own. Perhaps every side matters; perhaps one was the main good. There is no need to choose a single source or decide finally whether it was pleasure or joy. Accurate description reveals a desired continuation, needed conditions, and what is already complete without removing the right to a mixed answer.

If tomorrow's impression is weaker, yesterday's does not become invalid. Unsuccessful repetition does not yet prove the good an illusion. Wanting something else allows noticing change without requiring eternal loyalty to one sensation. No rule of impermanence solving every situation is offered here. We limit conclusions from a specific difference between events and leave room for further information.

Joy and pleasure can support activity, relationships, rest, and exploration. They can also end, mix with anxiety, or fail to appear where expected. Their variability need not become an accusation. Distinguish participation's content from a demand on the response. A beloved activity need not always feel pleasant; a pleasant pause need not become a beloved activity; another person need not manufacture our former mood.

What you want to keep concerns authorship of the next step. It promises no joy from choice but restores a specific subject for decision. Keep the opportunity to play music, time for conversation, acceptable rest, a meeting's memory. Sometimes the next step acknowledges an event remained good even though it cannot be repeated. That answer is as precise as planning a new evening if it fits the available circumstances.

The good needs no continuity to be part of life. It needs an honest scale of description: what happened, for whom, under which conditions, and with what continuation. Here pleasure retains dignity, joy gains no compulsory height, and the person remains free to distinguish experience. Failing to hold everything does not mean losing the meaning of what was lived.

What this means in practice

To apply the distinction, choose one manageable pleasant or joyful episode. The strongest memories are unnecessary. Name what happened, the participation available, and exactly what pleased you. If no answer appears, leave it open. This is voluntary clarification, not an examination of your capacity for joy or a way to explain a lasting changed condition by yourself.

Separate three questions: what was pleasant, what mattered, and what do you want to continue? Answers can match or differ. A dish's taste, conversation, and a discovered opportunity need no identical descriptions. You need not choose the deepest option to satisfy

the article. Private pleasure can be called private; meaningful participation can be recognised even when it included difficulty.

Then clarify conditions for one possible continuation. Is the same person, free time, a particular activity, or only memory needed? What depends on you, what requires agreement, what is unavailable now? The question creates no obligation to arrange repetition. Sometimes noticing what you would keep and acknowledging that actual conditions do not yet permit it without an unacceptable cost is enough.

If choosing a small step, make it specific: arrange a conversation, leave time for music, write down an important thought. Do not prescribe the former feeling's return as the outcome. An observable result can be a fulfilled agreement or clearly understood limit. Another person retains their own wish; a good past evening becomes no demand to agree to the next.

You can stop after describing. Keeping the moment in memory without a program is a complete decision. If reflection becomes difficult, the practice requires no continuation; if a feeling concerns you persistently, philosophy does not replace appropriate help. The possibility of the good remains an invitation rather than a new duty to fulfil before yourself or the article's authors.

Key quotation

> *“...without injury to his neighbour.”*

Spinoza, *Ethics*, part IV, proposition XLV, note; R. H. M. Elwes translation, Gutenberg no. 3800. A short fragment about permissible moderate enjoyments. This is a philosophical boundary, not a promise of pleasure's therapeutic effect.

Connections between traditions

Comparison	Intersection and boundary
Aristotle X ↔ pleasant activity	Pleasure accompanies activity; our scenes are no empirical proof of ancient ethics.
Aristotle ↔ Spinoza III	The good is not reduced to passively receiving a prize; complete activity and transition to greater fullness have different philosophical foundations.
Spinoza IV ↔ bodily pleasantness	Moderate food, music, and beauty belong to a good life; the author's list does not replace individual health conditions.
John 15 ↔ shared good	Joy is named in love's context; Christian faith and commandment are not a secular classification of emotions.
Spinoza's laughter and mockery ↔ responsibility	A pleasant response does not justify harm; responsibility for action differs from a verdict on the whole person.

Sources

• Aristotle, *The Nicomachean Ethics*, book X, chapters I–IV, Gutenberg no. 8438. Chapters I–II and III–IV were read in the specified English copy with J. A. Smith's introduction; the translator is not established from the publication data read. Arguments about activity, different pleasures, and a single criterion's limits are used.

• Spinoza, *Ethics*, R. H. M. Elwes translation, Gutenberg no. 3800. Metadata, III, proposition XI and note, IV, propositions XLIV–XLVII and context were read. The philosophical system differs from modern definitions and medical assistance.

• John 15:9–12, King James Version, 1611. The whole four-verse passage was read; the religious context of love and commandment is retained.

• NHS, *Symptoms — Depression in adults*, reviewed 5 July 2023. The substantive page was read; only the boundary of professional assessment is used, without self-diagnosis.

• Steven Nadler, *Baruch Spinoza*, Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, section 2.4. The section on passion and action was read; only the clarification of joy/pleasure as different translations is used, not a replacement for the primary text.

Tags

joy, pleasure, pleasantness, activity, participation, value, repetition, memory, continuation, relationships, taste, music, rest, moderation, cost, responsibility, laughter, mockery, love, distinction, intensity, separateness, conditions, choice, voluntary participation, Aristotle, Spinoza, John, fullness, boundaries

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