

UNITED WISDOM

Fact, Thought, and Feeling: Separating the Layers of One Episode

The Person and Inner Life

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

I20 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Fact, Thought, and Feeling: Separating the Layers of One Episode

Epigraph

> *“Let no act be done without a purpose”.*

Marcus Aurelius, *Meditations*, IV.2, the opening of George Long's translation. Book IV.

What this article is about

Within a difficult conversation, everything often arrives in one sentence: “He is disrespecting me again.” It may contain a remark we heard, a memory, an explanation of another person's intention, a feeling, and a response taking shape. Separating these elements helps us see what is known, experienced, and still needs checking. This article considers one limited episode without losing its living meaning. We examine observable events, personal accounts, thoughts, feelings, bodily sensations, expectations, actions, and consequences. These do not form a compulsory sequence for everyone. They are questions to select according to the situation. Philosophical and religious texts offer particular distinctions; research on emotion labeling reminds us of the limits of transferring a laboratory finding. The aim is a description that allows correction and supports a manageable next choice, while preserving the right not to continue the reflection now.

I. An episode begins with a boundary around the account

An episode is easier to examine when its beginning and end are clear. “Everything is always bad between us” may be an important message, but it does not identify a particular moment when something began happening differently. For an initial reflection, we can choose one conversation, email, or canceled meeting. This does not promise to uncover the entire history of a relationship. It reduces the number of claims requiring simultaneous examination and helps reveal the transition between an event, its understanding, and our response.

Imagine a family scene: over dinner, one person tells another that a planned trip is too expensive. A few minutes later, the conversation becomes an argument about who values whom. Beginning with the family's entire history can obscure the nearest transition. Selecting only the word “expensive” can obscure the question of a previously agreed budget. A useful boundary includes enough context: how the subject arose, which words were spoken, what followed, and when the conversation stopped. It need not be perfectly precise on the first attempt.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Sometimes the exact phrase is not remembered. We can then record: “This is approximately how I remember the meaning; I do not remember the exact words.” This does not make the account useless. It establishes its status. Later, consulting a message or clarifying another participant's memory may be appropriate and safe. Missing words should not be reconstructed from the confident feeling that “he must have said precisely that.” Remembering the strength of a reaction and remembering a formulation provide different information.

Within the chosen frame, external conditions also matter. Was time short? Was the subject an amount of money, a decision, or a way of participating? Who could actually change the plan? Sometimes clarifying one such fact makes an episode more intelligible without analyzing an entire personality. A good boundary does not trim away inconvenient circumstances; it marks the limits of the present work. Beyond it remains a history that can be considered separately if it would actually alter our understanding of this moment.

II. A recorded fact is not the same as independent verification

In personal reflection, “fact” often means something a person reports as having happened. A self-report and an independently established event nevertheless differ. “As I remember it, the meeting was canceled an hour beforehand” is a participant's account. A saved email with a sending time adds evidence. In a consequential dispute, preserving the difference helps. It does not pronounce someone unreliable; it shows exactly what supports the current picture and which correction might change it.

Consider a hypothetical employee who says their manager did not communicate a new date. The correspondence contains a message, but it was sent to a different group that did not include the employee. The initial statement may be accurate regarding their access to information and inaccurate regarding the entire notification system. Clarification produces another question: who should have ensured access, and how did its absence affect the work? A simple “you were wrong” would lose an important circumstance. A simple “you were secretly excluded” would add an unknown intention.

A record can use language that makes its grounds visible: “The email I received contains no date,” “I have not found a notification,” “The other person says they sent one.” These statements can coexist even when they initially seemed opposed. They describe different access to one event. More precise language sometimes changes a dispute about people's honesty into a question about a specific channel, deadline, and responsibility. This is a possible outcome, rather than a guarantee of reconciliation.

Available verification also has limits. Not every scene can be reconstructed, every record demanded, or every conversation repeated. An honest description can then retain what is unknown. It may still be sufficient for a small action: clarify the next deadline, change the

notification procedure, or end a conversation under certain conditions. Independent checking matters when it affects a decision. It should not become an unattainable prerequisite without which a person supposedly has no right to speak about their own experience.

III. A thought can report, infer, or predict

A phrase appearing in the mind does not always perform the same task. “He said the trip was expensive” reports a message. “My wishes do not matter to him” explains an attitude. “Now we will never go anywhere” predicts the future. Placing everything in a single “thought” column can remove useful distinctions. For the selected episode, asking what a statement does and on what grounds matters more than deciding whether it is positive or negative.

In *Meditations*, IV.12, Marcus Aurelius allows an opinion to change through convincing correction. This is Stoic ethics, rather than an instruction for a contemporary journal. A limited principle suits our format: the record should remain revisable. When a new circumstance requires a prediction to change, earlier experience need not be rewritten as though it never existed. We can preserve the initial thought and then identify the information that clarified it. The history of correction explains why today's description differs from yesterday's.

Suppose the trip's cost really proved unaffordable, but the other person suggested a different date. A conclusion of complete indifference is no longer so obvious. Disappointment about the first response and a question about how the discussion was conducted may remain. “He does not care” may be too broad, while a request to discuss constraints respectfully is quite specific. Separating an episode helps detach a useful request from an unconfirmed general accusation. The request can survive a changed interpretation.

There is no need to invent the opposite thought. “He does not value me” need not immediately become “He always cares about me.” “I inferred an attitude from one remark and have not considered other circumstances” may be enough. An alternative matters when it accounts for information and can be checked, rather than merely sounding calmer. A thought becomes a working hypothesis when questions about its grounds, limits, and conditions of revision remain possible.

IV. A feeling should be described from within, not through someone else's motive

“I feel that he is using me” begins grammatically with a feeling but conveys an explanation of someone else's conduct. A state can be expressed differently: “I feel hurt,” “I am tense,” “I want to leave,” “I cannot find a word yet.” This is not a competition in emotional literacy. The distinction leaves room for both elements: someone's experience and their understanding of another person. When one stands in for the other, discussion easily becomes an argument about whether the speaker is entitled to feel.

Imagine an employee saying “I am being used” after being asked to stay another hour. The episode may contain fatigue, irritation, concern about personal plans, and a conclusion about unfair allocation of tasks. The emotion's name cannot reveal a ready need or establish exploitation. The schedule, earlier agreements, ability to refuse, and consequences of refusal can be examined separately. The feeling retains significance while assessment of the conditions gains its own grounds. Sometimes those grounds are stronger than the initial general statement.

In Psalm 42:5 according to KJV numbering, experience is named through an address to one's soul and placed within religious hope in God. Russian Synodal numbering gives the psalm a different number; the numbering of the edition actually read is deliberately preserved here. The text is not a classifier of states or a method of establishing causes. It shows a historical way of speaking about internal experience, which cannot mechanically be declared a modern psychological practice.

An ordinary record can also use a brief description without a noun: “After that phrase, I tensed up and stopped responding.” This does not explain everything, but it preserves an observation. Later, the experience may be named differently. Clarification does not make the earlier words morally wrong. A vocabulary serves contact with experience and conversation; it should not become another requirement that must be satisfied before someone receives attention.

V. Sensation, impulse, and action do not belong on one line

In a difficult episode, we can notice bodily sensation, a desire to do something, and actual action. “I felt hot,” “I wanted to snap back,” and “I raised my voice” describe different elements. They may occur close together but need not form a universal chain. Wanting to reply sharply does not show that someone did so. An outwardly calm response does not show the absence of a strong impulse. To examine consequences, what was actually done must remain separate from imagined action.

Suppose someone wanted to slam the door in the family scene but remained silent. “I lost control” would be inaccurate if it meant an act that never happened. Silence could nevertheless have a function and consequences: the other person did not understand the objection, the discussion remained unfinished, distance emerged. This does not make silence always bad. It means action needs a specific description. “I stopped answering and went to another room” may be more useful than judging the entire episode with one word.

In *Of Anger*, II.1–4, Seneca distinguishes an initial movement from subsequent assent to an intention. We use this philosophical source only to separate what arises from what is continued. His definition of anger belongs to the Stoic assessment of passions and differs from everyday vocabulary. The distinction does not prove every impulse is easy to stop or permit judgment about a particular person's freedom without knowing their conditions. It helps formulate a question without providing its answer in advance.

For our own episode, we can ask: what did I notice, what was I drawn to do, what did I do, and what followed? Unremembered sensations should not be reconstructed from a template. An action that seemed automatic can be described that way. The possibility of a subsequent choice is considered separately: is a pause, another phrase, or a change of conditions available? An empty line is more honest than an invented bodily response, invented desire, or excessively tidy story absent from the memory.

VI. Sequence can test a convenient explanation

Once the elements are recorded, it helps to consider their actual order. We often explain an episode as though we first correctly understood another person's motive, then naturally felt and acted. Memory may reveal something else: fatigue preceded the remark, a sharp reply preceded the final conclusion, the explanation took shape after the argument. Order does not establish causation by itself. It may show that a preferred causal story is not yet supported by the description of the event itself.

In a hypothetical example, someone returned home after several urgent tasks. The discussion of travel costs began before dinner. Their reply was sharp; “My wishes never count” emerged after the other person fell silent. Recording only that final thought and the surrounding anger removes the earlier burden and the participants' effects on the conversation. Explaining everything through fatigue removes the substance of the disagreement. A good description permits several conditions without reducing them to a single psychological explanation.

A sequence can be reconstructed approximately: “We first discussed the amount; then I remembered an earlier cancellation; afterward I stopped responding.” The approximation should be noted. One such account cannot justify a confident conclusion about a recurring mechanism. Recurrence requires comparable episodes, differences between them, and

consideration of alternatives. A real resemblance may concern the manner of speaking, lack of time, or negotiation procedure, rather than a hidden character trait. One similar feeling does not establish an entire pattern.

In practice, sequence helps where it reveals an available place for change. Perhaps major expenses should be discussed before tickets are purchased. Perhaps the first question is whether a remark means refusal or the beginning of a calculation. Perhaps the relevant issue is ending a conversation without disappearing. These suggestions concern the scene's conditions and remain hypotheses. Checking them is a separate action with an observable result. A beautifully reconstructed sequence does not itself mean that the original difficulty has been resolved.

VII. Naming helps description without promising relief

Finding a word sometimes makes conversation more precise. “I feel ashamed” and “I am afraid I cannot manage” may lead to different clarifications, although both states were initially called bad. A word has no guaranteed power, however. We can name an experience and continue feeling it. Relief can come before a clear name. A personal reflection's quality cannot be judged solely by how quickly someone feels better after using an appropriate emotional term.

In Matthew Lieberman and colleagues' 2007 study, labeling images' emotional content was studied using functional MRI. The available publisher abstract describes activity differences between labeling and other processing conditions; it does not give the sample size. We do not invent that number or represent this access as reading the full article. A laboratory task involving images does not establish that naming one's own complex situation will necessarily reduce an experience or replace necessary action.

Applying this to an episode involves a more modest claim than a scientific promise: a word helps if it communicates something previously lost in a general phrase. “I am anxious about the unknown amount” identifies an object better than “Everything is awful.” “I am angry that the decision was made without me” contains a feeling and an examinable question about participation. Even here, how the decision was made needs clarification. Precise language helps pose the question; it does not answer it instead of the facts.

When a name is unavailable, qualities can be described temporarily: unpleasant, heavy, tense, wanting distance. Several words can be offered, with room to reject them all. We can return later. Declining to choose a word should not be treated as hidden resistance or insufficient maturity. Sometimes circumstances are too complex for one term; sometimes another question is needed. A useful vocabulary expands choice without replacing someone's description with a ready category they must accept.

VIII. What is unknown should remain visible

A good description retains gaps. Motive is unknown, a remark's meaning unclear, the precise sequence forgotten, the desired outcome not yet chosen. Filling these gaps for a completed diagram is risky: an orderly record then stops showing the actual extent of knowledge. Unknowns do not necessarily prevent every action. They prevent particular conclusions. We may not know why someone refused and still decide that the current date does not work. That requires no final judgment about what the refusal means for the relationship.

In the hypothetical family scene, whether “expensive” means a complete refusal of the trip is unknown. An available question is: “Are we discussing the amount, or do you not want to go at all?” Those answers significantly alter the next conversation, so clarification has a purpose. “You are just afraid to enjoy yourself, aren't you?” already contains a causal hypothesis and makes disagreement difficult. Even a question can impose an interpretation. Keeping a gap genuinely open requires allowing answers that change the original understanding.

Gaps can be distinguished by their practical importance. Buying tickets requires an amount and participants' agreement. Considering the discussion's manner requires an exact phrase or an honest qualification about memory. A definitive judgment about motive may never have sufficient information. Putting all these needs together produces either endless analysis or excessive haste. It is more useful to identify which unknown could change the nearest choice and which action would actually provide new information.

Gaps also have a human boundary. Another person need not disclose their entire internal experience; anyone may decline to discuss parts of their history. We can then work with conditions of participation and existing agreements. Reflection gives no right to demand access to someone else's mind. Its precision depends less on the number of disclosures obtained than on clearly separating available information, voluntary accounts, personal hypotheses, and the area where further knowledge is currently absent.

IX. The format should preserve life rather than displace it

Separating layers becomes useless if someone no longer recognizes their episode afterward. An excessively rigid diagram can remove tone, relationships, material constraints, and what mattered. A list of observable actions may be insufficient for a conversation between close people. A long emotional analysis cannot replace calculations in a dispute about money. A format should serve the situation, helping retain its layers without demanding that an entire life fit an identical number of boxes.

Imagine two records of one scene. The first reads: “Fact: he said expensive; thought: I am not valued; feeling: hurt.” The second adds that tickets had been researched together, the amount

increased, no spending limit had been agreed, and the remark followed a question about purchasing. The second is longer, but not necessarily better in every respect. It preserves circumstances that change the first account's meaning. Sometimes one line about an agreement makes the picture less accusatory and more actionable.

Reflection should not be weaponized against someone else: “Here is your thought, here is the wrong feeling, here is the right action.” A personal map remains one's own way of finding orientation. In a shared discussion, another person can change the description or reject a hypothesis. Not every conversation must end in a common picture. Partial outcomes are possible: deadlines agreed, one inaccurate phrase acknowledged, a way to communicate refusal found. Explanations sometimes continue to differ without making a concrete agreement a failure.

Marcus Aurelius connects consideration with action and people's good; laboratory labeling studies another task; the psalm addresses God. These sources cannot be combined into a single proven protocol. Comparison helps distinguish the purposes of different kinds of speech. Some words examine events, others express experience, others guide ethical decisions. A good format allows these functions to coexist without declaring one the only permissible way to speak about what happened.

X. A next step needs a purpose and proportion

After describing an episode, we can understand more and still not know what to do. This is a normal distinction between clarity and action. A next step depends on the desired benefit, resources, role, and consequences for participants. “I want to stop being angry” and “I want to agree on a budget” set different tasks. Sometimes choosing the second while retaining the feeling is reasonable. Sometimes the nearest aim is ending a conversation without additional harm and returning to its substance later. A map should not promise action merely because all its lines are filled.

In the hypothetical travel episode, a small step might be that each person names an affordable amount by the following evening, then discusses options together. This cannot guarantee agreement or resolve the entire relationship history. It tests a specific hypothesis: can a clear budget change the conversation? The result will appear in the actual discussion, available options, and allocation of expenses. If conditions do not change, the picture needs updating, rather than a declaration that people failed to name emotions correctly.

A step is better described in a way that separates intention from execution. “I want to ask” is an intention. “I asked” is an action. “They answered” is an event. “It became clear that the dates do not work” is a resulting distinction. “We agreed on another date” is a separate shared outcome. These stages need not coincide. A complete cycle cannot be declared finished when

only understanding and a possible phrase exist. Understanding itself may nevertheless be sufficient for the present stage if that was the person's desired result.

Proportion preserves the freedom to stop. We can decide not to send a drafted message, decline a joint discussion, choose only to clarify an amount, or leave the question open until resources become available. This does not remove responsibility for completed actions or clear agreements. It retains the difference between voluntary further inquiry and a demand to finish every diagram neatly. An episode is sufficiently separated when its description serves the current choice, rather than when all unknowns have disappeared.

What this means in practice

Begin with one sentence defining the boundary: which conversation or moment are you considering? Then record the reported event and its grounds, your thought, a feeling in available words, the action, and its consequence. Keep unknowns separate. Not every element needs filling when it cannot be remembered or makes no difference to understanding. Two useful distinctions are better than a detailed format with half its answers invented for order. This is an authors' descriptive approach, not a validated universal protocol for changing emotions.

For the hypothetical travel scene, the record might read: “We discussed purchasing; I heard that the amount was high; concluded that my wishes did not matter; felt hurt; stopped answering; the amount and agreement remained unclear.” The next question concerns an unknown: are we discussing the spending limit or the trip itself? A possible step is agreeing on an amount before purchasing. Afterward, the record is updated with what actually emerged. If no action has occurred yet, the present stage remains exactly that: a description prepared, action not taken, outcome not observed.

If the other person corrects your record, clarify which part they dispute: words, timing, agreement, motive, or consequence. Correction of one element does not erase the episode. You can acknowledge an inaccurate quotation while retaining a question about expenses; clarify a deadline while retaining the experience. Update the affected distinction rather than choosing between complete surrender and complete defense of the initial account.

Key quotation

> *“Why art thou cast down, O my soul?”*

Psalm 42:5, King James Version, the opening question. The edition read and its numbering. The continuation directs hope toward God; this religious context has not been replaced with a psychological promise.

Connections between traditions

Comparison	Similarity	Limit
Marcus Aurelius ↔ a revisable record	An opinion can be considered and changed.	Stoic ethics is not a modern journaling protocol.
Seneca ↔ sensation, impulse, action	An emerging movement differs from subsequent intention.	Philosophical passion is not identical to an everyday feeling label.
Psalm ↔ speaking of experience	Internal experience receives an address and a question.	Hope in God retains the text's religious purpose.
Lieberman ↔ emotional vocabulary	Naming is a distinct operation that can be studied.	An image-based fMRI task does not promise relief in a personal episode.
Philosophical consideration ↔ practical reflection	Distinguishing is connected to a subsequent choice.	The authors' format is not presented as a method endorsed by every tradition.

Primary sources and research

• Marcus Aurelius. *Meditations*, IV.2, IV.12; translated by George Long. Purpose of action and the possibility of revising an opinion.

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

• Psalm 42:5, King James Version. A question about internal experience; numbering of the edition read.

• Lieberman, M. D., and colleagues. *Putting Feelings Into Words*. Psychological Science 18, 421–428, 2007. Publisher abstract read; fMRI and limits on transferring emotion-labeling findings.

Tags

episode, fact, self-report, evidence, thought, feeling, interpretation, prediction, memory, sequence, unknowns, bodily sensation, impulse, action, consequence, agreement, budget, conversation, question, consent, purpose, proportion, correction, emotional vocabulary, Marcus Aurelius, Seneca, psalm, emotion labeling, orientation, choice

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.