

UNITED WISDOM

“I Feel Nothing”: How to Approach an Unclear Experience

Human Nature and Inner World

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

I28 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

“I Feel Nothing”: How to Approach an Unclear Experience

Epigraph

> *“No formula fits every person.”*

Eugene T. Gendlin, An Introduction to Focusing: Six Steps, Instructions for Not Following Instructions, 1996. A short passage from the verified text; the Russian version uses an editorial translation.

What this article is about

In an illustrative scene, someone leaves an important conversation. A friend asks how they feel. “Nothing,” they reply. At home, however, they reread a message several times, forget dinner, and hesitate to answer. This does not prove concealed resentment. They may be tired, occupied with something else, or not yet understand their response. But here “nothing” may indicate a limit to the description available, rather than an established absence of any experience.

When no clear name appears inside, it is easy to choose one of two extremes: declare yourself unfeeling or force yourself to find the expected emotion. This article proposes another order: clarify what is actually known, preserve the right to uncertainty, and choose a manageable action. A scientific review distinguishes difficulties identifying and describing feelings; Gendlin considers unclear experience within his approach; a Stoic note by Marcus Aurelius recalls attentive listening. These grounds differ. None permits a diagnosis, the cause of silence, or an obligatory way of inner work to be established from a single phrase.

I. What Exactly Does “Nothing” Mean?

“I feel nothing” can answer different questions. Is there no strong emotion? No suitable word? No wish to speak? No confidence that the answer will be accepted? No noticeable response right now? These meanings should not be merged. Someone may understand their state and keep it private. They may wish to describe it but be unable to. They may really notice no substantial experience. The distinction serves selection of a next step, rather than examination of their sincerity.

In an illustrative family, a loved one expects joy after good news. The recipient answers calmly. If calmness has already been deemed wrong, a question about feeling becomes an

examination in love. Naming experience is now harder: every answer is compared with the expected one. Meaning can be clarified without a demand: “Have you not noticed a response yet, or would you prefer not to discuss it?” The person can choose a third answer: “I don't know how to say it.” That answer contains information: the boundary of today's clarity.

An absence of familiar vividness does not establish an absence of value either. One can care for someone, fulfil a promise, and sustain attention without a strong emotional uplift. One can react intensely and disregard the other in one's actions. This is an editorial distinction between experience and behaviour. It does not make emotions unnecessary; it limits the conclusion their intensity can support. Requiring significance to be proved through strength of response narrows the ways people can participate.

Returning time and an object to the statement is useful. “After this conversation, I cannot yet name a feeling” is more precise than “I never feel anything.” This clarification guarantees no future clarity. It simply avoids extending one moment across a whole life. If the difficulty is longstanding, that can also be named: “In many situations, describing my state is hard.” Describing a pattern remains a description; its cause and appropriate forms of support require separate consideration.

A deeper answer need not be sought immediately. One can acknowledge the literal fact: there is no clear answer now. External information remains available: what happened, who said what, and which decision is required. Unclear experience does not destroy all orientation. Even without an emotional name, one can notice that it is late, fatigue has increased, and an answer can wait until morning. Such small precision is often more useful than a global conclusion about one's inner emptiness.

II. Difficulty Naming Is Different from Absence of Experience

In their 2021 review Alexithymia, Jeremy Hogeveen and Jordan Grafman consider a scientific construct including difficulties identifying and describing feelings. The introduction distinguishes several components and acknowledges different models. This is a review, not an examination of the person in our scene. Only a limited distinction is borrowed here: an ability to describe a state differs from the state itself. A term from a scientific text does not diagnose a reader following a single unclear remark.

This distinction does not mean a strong emotion must be hidden behind every “nothing.” An inner response may be weak, mixed, or unrelated to the event being discussed. Nor does the opposite follow: if no name has been found, there is no response. Both conclusions close the question before observation. For now, several possibilities can remain without making one an obligatory story about yourself. The unknown has a right to remain unknown.

In an illustrative workplace episode, an employee learns that their duties will change. They say they are fine with it but postpone discussing details. This could involve uncertainty, disagreement, insufficient time, or an ordinary wish to read the document first. Instead of searching for a secret feeling, one can begin with specifics: which duties are clear, what needs clarification, and when a conversation is possible? The person can then understand the situation even while their inner response remains unclear. An organisational problem need not await an emotional admission.

A vocabulary can expand description but also replace it. Choosing “disappointment” simply because it suits the plot produces the right word without confidence in the experience. A degree of supposition is better: “It resembles disappointment, but not quite.” This is not a weak answer. It preserves a distinction between the recognisable part and what has not matched yet. A list of emotions can offer possibilities; it need not be a form that must be completed.

Comparison with others is limited too. One person quickly names a complex mixture; another speaks through events or images; a third prefers silence first. Speed alone cannot establish who feels more deeply or loves more. Even one's habitual ease of description does not mean infallibility. One can describe feelings beautifully and miss a substantial detail. In this article, precision depends on willingness to clarify, rather than the number of psychological words in an answer.

III. The Body Offers Information, Not a Ready Verdict

Sometimes only bodily details are available: heaviness in the shoulders, clenched fingers, a wish to move away from a screen. These can be noticed as details of experience. But tension does not prove anxiety, and warmth does not prove love. Bodily states have many possible conditions, including ordinary fatigue and the environment. This article does not propose decoding them through a chart. Observation is useful when it retains its modest form: “This is what I notice now,” without adding a cause not yet examined.

In An Introduction to Focusing: Six Steps, Gendlin describes attending to an initially unclear holistic sense of a situation and seeking a fitting word or image. This describes his own approach, rather than independently proving its effectiveness. Its order differs from translating every bodily signal into an emotion's name. A limited possibility matters for our conversation: description can become clearer gradually. The full procedure is neither reproduced here nor prescribed to every reader.

In an illustrative episode, someone chooses between two invitations. Thinking of one brings a wish to postpone answering. They can call this “heavy” while retaining uncertainty. They can then examine conditions: is there a long journey, unfamiliar people, or a previously broken promise? The word helps retain the question but does not settle it automatically. The invitation

may really be unsuitable. The difficulty may concern travel rather than the relationship. Distinguishing these possibilities preserves choice more accurately than an instruction to hear the body as an infallible voice.

Inner attention is not comfortable for everyone at every time. If it intensifies an unpleasant state, one can stop, attend to the surroundings, or turn to an external task. A special experience need not be obtained to prove the exercise correct. This is an editorial boundary for voluntary practice. Suitable support for prolonged severe difficulties is selected separately; this article does not determine their origin. Declining one particular form of self-observation is different from declining to understand oneself.

It is useful to distinguish an experience's message from establishing a fact. An inner sense of threat does not establish another's intention. Relief does not guarantee a contract is reasonable. Experience offers information about our current response; documents, behaviour, and conditions are examined in other ways. When these ways complement one another, feeling receives a place in a decision without authority to declare the world safe, hostile, or obliged to match our reaction on its own.

IV. An Approximate Word Can Be More Honest Than a Precise One

There is a broad range of speech between silence and a final name. “As if something is unfinished,” “I don't want to return to the subject,” or “there is interest and tension together” need no pure category. These phrases are useful if they allow the next question to be examined. A metaphor does not explain a cause but sometimes preserves a quality for which no other language is available. It should not be evaluated as a scientific term or required to mean the same thing to every listener.

In an illustrative scene after a meeting, someone says that inside it is “like after an overly loud room.” The listener need not immediately translate this into anxiety. They can ask which part of the comparison matters: fatigue, excessive impressions, a wish for silence, or inability to choose one voice? The answer may change the image. Such conversation makes description joint work in which the initial phrase allows correction. A beautiful image gains no immunity merely because it once seemed precise.

Approximation differs from perpetual evasion. When a promise needs discussing, “it is complicated inside” may communicate a state without answering whether work will be completed. The answers can be separated: “My response isn't clear yet; I'll send the document tomorrow,” or “I need a pause; the deadline must be renegotiated.” The inner process and the external agreement have different requirements concerning time. Preserving uncertainty does not automatically remove the consequences of a choice already made.

A word can also stop fitting. In the morning, someone called their state emptiness; in the evening, they noticed anger and then understood that part concerned insufficient sleep. This does not necessarily expose the first phrase as false. The first description may have been accurate at the scale then available. What matters is avoiding a rewritten history in which new clarity supposedly existed from the start. The sequence can remain: what was noticed, what was added, and what remains supposed. Revision then does not require accusing oneself of earlier dishonesty.

A recognition check helps in conversation: “When I repeat your word, does it resemble what you wanted to say?” The speaker may say no. Their correction has priority in describing their own experience without establishing every external fact. This distinction allows respectful listening alongside discussion of events. Someone can clarify their feeling; the other can clarify what happened between them. Neither side needs to absorb the other.

The language of conversation matters too. In an illustrative international family, someone readily discusses work in the shared language but is unsure how to convey an experiential nuance. A listener may interpret brevity as coldness, although whether it concerns feelings or available words remains unknown. Description in another language, a comparison with a situation, or a simple request for silence can be allowed. This choice does not establish the difficulty's cause but expands means of communication. When translating, clarify which nuance was lost: intensity, direction, time, or a response to action. No single perfect equivalent is required. Sometimes jointly understanding which treatment is acceptable now is enough. This does not prove that culture determines every person's inner experience. It recalls a limit to our conclusion: fluent speech in one area does not guarantee equal precision in every other. A shortage of familiar words cannot establish that someone has nothing to communicate, and they should not be forced to agree with the first translation that satisfies the listener.

V. Time Helps Only When the Question Is Retained

An answer sometimes appears later. Sometimes only more detailed uncertainty appears later. A pause should therefore not be promised as a mechanism of obligatory revelation. It changes conditions: one can sleep, finish urgent work, reread a note, or receive new information. These are possibilities, not a guarantee. Postponement becomes more useful when someone understands which question they will return to and which external decision can be retained until then.

In an illustrative conversation, partners discuss moving. One does not understand their response and requests a week. Clarification gives the request substance: during the week, they will examine work conditions, consider available contact with others, and separately notice what arises when thinking of change. “I still don't know” remains permissible a week

later, but it will accompany new information. A pause need not end in agreement. Its purpose is to restore an opportunity for a more considered conversation.

The other participant also has time and boundaries, however. If one person's uncertainty constantly postpones the other's decisions, limits to waiting need agreement. A feeling need not be demanded, but an available commitment can be clarified. For example, retain the previous option until a certain date, then choose from available information. This is an editorial organisational example, not a universal formula for a couple. Respect for unclear experience is compatible with respect for the life of someone awaiting an answer.

Returning to the question can be small. An entire biography need not be re-examined. It is enough to ask whether description changed, new facts appeared, or part of the decision became available. If nothing changed, examine the format itself: perhaps the question is too broad or is discussed under continual pressure. The cause of uncertainty cannot be inferred from that guess; another way of talking can simply be chosen and assessed for whether it added a useful distinction.

Waiting sometimes becomes a search for a perfect inner signal. Someone postpones every choice until complete confidence, although no source in this article promises it. Then necessary clarity can be distinguished from desirable clarity. Declining an invitation sometimes requires only an absence of free time, rather than a final theory of one's relationship to people. An obligation can be fulfilled through reference to an agreement. Experience matters, but not every action must await its complete explanation.

VI. Listening to an Answer That Has Not Taken Shape

In Meditations, VI, XLVIII in this edition, Marcus Aurelius addresses attentive listening to another person. This is a Stoic ethical note, not contemporary research on dialogue. It can be compared with our question in only one respect: our own ready thought sometimes interferes with hearing another's. The ancient text retains its philosophical context; it does not prove that listening will necessarily reveal an unclear emotion.

In an illustrative conversation between friends, one says: “I feel rather empty.” The other immediately supplies three causes and recommends rest. The advice may be reasonable, but what was being described remains unknown. A slower response is possible: “Would you like to try describing it, or would it be better just to be together now?” The offer requires no inner report. It gives a choice among conversation, presence, and a boundary. Help begins by agreeing an available format, rather than defeating silence.

Questions should remain open to refusal. “You're angry, aren't you?” already suggests an answer. “What is noticeable now?” allows no answer. Yet even an open question can press when repeated ten times. Meaning comes from the whole sequence of interaction. If someone

asks to stop, that is a request for a boundary, not proof that we have approached their hidden truth. Persistence has no automatic right to call itself care.

The listener can communicate limits to their own possibilities too. “I can listen for half an hour, but don't know how to help with a decision now” is more honest than promising complete understanding. Support does not require one's own life to disappear. If another format is needed, it can be sought without concluding that the friendship failed. Conversation sometimes helps precisely because nobody has been appointed an expert in the other's inner world. There is attention, clarification, and a right not to know together.

An unclear answer should not be supplemented with someone else's biography. “You've always been like this because of your family” may sound explanatory but requires information and grounds absent from the conversation. Remaining with the particular episode is better. If the person connects it with the past themselves, that connection can be heard as their account. History matters, but need not become a key another person uses without permission to open every present answer.

VII. Decisions Are Possible with Incomplete Inner Clarity

Our response to an event and a decision about action are related but different. One may not yet know whether a new offer is welcome while already knowing its deadline is impossible. One may have mixed feelings about a meeting and nevertheless agree to a short conversation. Incomplete clarity obliges neither agreement nor refusal. It calls for naming which grounds for a decision are available now and which part remains open. Choice thus gains support without an invented emotion.

In an illustrative episode, someone does not know whether to continue a joint project. They nevertheless understand that they can no longer work in the evenings. They can first change the schedule and consider the project under new conditions. This does not promise that a true desire will emerge after the change. It separates one established limit from general uncertainty. If the project is incompatible with the limit, a decision may become clear from its conditions while the inner response remains complex.

Action has reversibility and a cost. A small trial is permissible where its consequences are agreed and manageable. A large commitment cannot be declared an experiment on oneself if its price falls on another person without consent. A short meeting and a promise of a long partnership have different scales, for example. Unclear experience gives no special exemption from discussing risks. Autonomy includes possibilities to try and responsibility for understandable conditions of that trial.

An absence of a name does not mean someone must permit everything. “This doesn't suit me” is possible even if the cause has not been fully formulated. But where relationships include an

agreement, explaining the available part and renegotiating commitments is useful. A right to a boundary does not depend on a beautiful emotional account; how the boundary is enacted can consider consequences. Respect for oneself thus joins respect for people directly affected by our answer.

A reasonable step sometimes retains an existing arrangement while it remains acceptable and schedules reconsideration. Sometimes it stops an action because information is insufficient. Sometimes it seeks professional support for a persistent difficulty substantially interfering with life. This article does not choose for the reader. It proposes criteria: available facts, actual obligations, manageability, reversibility, and possibilities for clarification. These help action proceed without requiring someone to become completely transparent to themselves first.

VIII. Do Not Turn Uncertainty into an Identity

After several difficult answers, it is easy to say: “This is who I am; I have no feelings.” This conclusion exceeds the observations. Even a persistent way of describing experience does not exhaust a person. They have actions, interests, relationships, history, and conditions of life today. This article promises no hidden richness behind every silence. It proposes neither reducing a whole life to one difficulty nor turning an absent word into a final identity document.

Another's clarity should not become a norm everyone must meet either. In an illustrative group, one participant readily describes experience; another speaks briefly and prefers discussing tasks. The group can agree different forms of participation. Joint work needs sufficient information, but not necessarily equal intimacy. Measuring openness by the length of an account rewards expressiveness rather than precision. Someone starts performing the expected inner monologue.

Respect for a style does not mean a prolonged interfering difficulty must be romanticised, however. If someone wants to understand their states better, that wish matters. Suitable language, a conversational format, or support can be sought while preserving a right to assess results. But the aim belongs to them. It should not arise only because others prefer a more emotional response. Discussing change through the particular life they wish to make easier or clearer is more useful.

A sign of movement can be a very small clarification: previously “nothing,” now “after these conversations, I want silence.” This is not yet a cause, diagnosis, or final feeling. But information appears that can be used: leave time after the meeting, discuss its format, and examine whether the observation repeats. Precision grows without a promise of a major inner discovery. An absence of dramatic results does not make a small attentive distinction meaningless.

Return to the person rereading a message. In the morning, they may notice resentment, interest, fatigue, or still find no word. They retain an opportunity to answer according to known conditions and communicate the boundary of their clarity. “I don't yet understand what I feel” leaves a door open to clarification. No truth known beforehand has to be behind that door. It is enough that the person stops fitting themselves to an obligatory answer and gains a right to learn gradually what is available.

What this means in practice

Choose one recent episode you are willing to consider voluntarily. First record the external event without explaining others' motives. Then clarify your phrase: is there no strong response, no name, no wish to discuss it, or no confidence yet? If these cannot be distinguished, leave that explicitly noted. The exercise does not require proving a hidden feeling exists.

Name one available detail: a thought, a wish to do something, a change in attention, or a bodily sensation. Do not automatically translate it into an emotion or infer another's intention from it. Try an approximate word or image and note your confidence. If the approach is unpleasant, stop; events and conditions alone can be considered.

Separate the inner question from the external decision. Which obligation already exists? What needs answering and when? Which small step is possible under several explanations of your state? If the action affects another person, agree its scale and consequences. Uncertainty can be communicated honestly while retaining responsibility for the available part of the decision.

If you wish, return to the note later under suitable conditions. Record what was added and what remained. Do not correct the past retrospectively: earlier uncertainty was part of the process. When speaking with someone close, request the format needed now: listening, clarification of an event, shared presence, or a pause. The listener can also name their boundaries.

This practice is an editorial suggestion for orientation, without established effectiveness or a promise of treatment. Suitable support for prolonged severe difficulty can be sought separately. A permissible result is a more precise “I don't know” and one manageable choice. Clarity need not appear on demand for today's description to deserve respect.

Key quotation

> *“You can always come back.”*

Eugene T. Gendlin, An Introduction to Focusing: Six Steps, opening instructions before Clearing a Space, 1996. A short passage from the verified text; the Russian text gives an editorial translation. This permits returning to a step rather than promising a result.

Connections between traditions

Comparison	Similarity	Substantial difference
Scientific review ↔ describing experience	Naming differs from experience	A scientific construct cannot establish a diagnosis from an ordinary phrase
Gendlin ↔ gradual clarification	The unclear may receive a more fitting description	An author's approach differs from independent evidence of effectiveness
Marcus Aurelius ↔ listening	A ready thought can interfere with attention	Stoic ethics promises no revelation of a hidden emotion
Bodily detail ↔ information about a situation	Both can participate in a decision	A sensation does not establish another's intention or an external fact
Pause ↔ responsibility	Clarification needs suitable conditions	Inner time does not cancel external agreements

This is an editorial map: limited motifs are compared without claiming unity of approaches or doctrines.

Sources

1. Jeremy Hogeveen, Jordan Grafman. Alexithymia. Handbook of Clinical Neurology, 183, 2021, 47–62. DOI 10.1016/B978-0-12-822290-4.00004-9. The abstract, introduction, and a selected passage discussing measurement and limitations were read; neither the full review nor cited studies were read.

2. Eugene T. Gendlin. An Introduction to Focusing: Six Steps, The Focusing Institute, 1996; document #2234, version 071008, with a note concerning the 2007 book. The complete available short page, including cautions about instructions, was read; the full book was not read.

3. Marcus Aurelius. Meditations, Project Gutenberg #2680, updated 13 July 2026. Selected passages VI, XLVII–LIII and edition notes were read; the entire work was not read. This digital edition's Notes identify Meric Casaubon's translation and comparison of the 1634 and 1635 editions; selected editorial corrections are also acknowledged.

Tags

experience, feeling, uncertainty, naming, description, attention, listening, pause, boundary, choice, autonomy, body, observation, supposition, precision, Gendlin, Marcus Aurelius, alexithymia, scientific review, dialogue, responsibility, agreement, metaphor, support, clarity, self-understanding, distinction, respect

About the authors

Andrey Zarinsh is the author and founder of United Wisdom. He explores inner transformation, unity across 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 operate in real life between people and cultures. Instagram: @ilkutki.