

UNITED WISDOM

How a Friend's Observation Differs from a Label

The Person and the Inner World

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

I-04-N01 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

How a Friend's Observation Differs from a Label

Epigraph

> *“Don't say that he does it ill”*

Epictetus, Enchiridion 45, a fragment of the example about bathing quickly, in Elizabeth Carter's translation. The Russian rendering is the author's translation through Carter. The issue is the ground for an assessment, not a ban on every judgment.

What this article is about

A friend's comment can reveal something someone has missed in their behavior. But closeness makes no assessment automatically accurate, and unpleasant words do not prove an important truth. Several transitions separate an observation from a label: from action to recurring habit, from habit to proposed cause, from one case to a description of the entire person. We examine these transitions through an invented story of two friends preparing a city walk. Epictetus helps distinguish description from assessment; Simine Vazire's study clarifies the subject and limits of outside knowledge; Aristotle and Proverbs explore friendship, care, and an unwelcome comment. Their grounds differ. This article proposes neither abandoning criticism nor treating every criticism as care. It asks what information a particular observation contains, what the speaker adds by inference, and how to discuss those inferences while retaining responsibility for an action and freedom to reject a final label.

I. One Comment Contains Different Claims

Imagine Vera and Dmitri preparing a walk through old streets for acquaintances. Vera promised to send a route diagram by noon but sent it in the evening. Dmitri could not print his handout in time and said, “You cannot be relied on.” Vera can acknowledge when she sent it while disputing the general conclusion. This is not necessarily evading responsibility. One short comment combines at least two subjects: a missed agreement about a specific deadline and an assessment of someone's reliability in general. The story is invented for discussion, not taken from observation or research. It lets us examine the structure of a comment without trying to discover real participants' personalities.

“The diagram arrived in the evening rather than at noon” concerns an event taken as established in this example. “I could not prepare the sheet” describes a consequence for Dmitri. “You knew I needed printing time” concerns Vera's understanding and requires

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

separate clarification. “You do not value my work” adds an explanation of an attitude or motive. Finally, “You cannot be relied on” generalizes across possible situations and promises. Each further inference needs more information. The delay does not disappear if the last statement is excessive. But acknowledging a delay does not require accepting every subsequent step as already proved by that fact. Each claim must retain the grounds appropriate to its scope.

The conversation becomes difficult when evidence at one level serves accusation or defense at another. Vera explains that she always tries to help; Dmitri repeats that the sheet was not ready. A good intention changes no deadline, while an absent sheet establishes no complete account of intentions. A more precise discussion asks which claim is at issue now. They can acknowledge the particular agreement first, clarify consequences, and separately examine recurrence. This order guarantees neither calm nor agreement. It merely reveals where participants share grounds and where they add different conclusions. A friend's comment becomes open to examination when its subject does not change with every reply. Otherwise, an answer to one claim can always be treated as failing to answer another.

II. Description and Assessment Need Different Grounds

In instruction 45 of the Enchiridion, Epictetus recommends saying that someone bathes quickly rather than badly. Without knowing the principle behind the action, observation should not be hastily connected to evaluative judgment. The historical passage also mentions drinking quantity; no conclusion about drinking safety is drawn here. What matters is the move from description to assessment. “Late” can already be an assessment relative to a deadline, but Vera's deadline was specified. “Generally unreliable” has a different scope. Assessing an action requires naming the rule or expectation by which it is assessed. A negative word alone does not make a comment a label. The relevant question is what the assessment claims and whether its grounds support that claim.

If Vera promised noon, Dmitri has grounds to discuss failure to keep that promise. Without an agreed time, his expectation still matters but differs from a broken agreement. He can say that he counted on an early answer and ask whether Vera knew this. The distinction changes the correction's subject: fulfill what was agreed, or first agree on what is necessary. Specificity need not remove every assessment and feeling from speech. “I became angry because I had no sheet” describes Dmitri's experience and his understanding of the connection. It can contribute to the conversation without replacing examination of what was promised, understood, and available to the participants that day. Personal dissatisfaction and the terms of an agreement remain distinguishable.

Vazire's study compares self-ratings and ratings by others with selected behavioral criteria. This differs from a Stoic instruction while emphasizing the need to specify what is being checked. An assessment is not accurate merely because it comes from outside. Friends need

not conduct an experiment; a more modest question follows: which action and standard connect an impression to a conclusion? Dmitri can identify the deadline and consequence without possessing a general measure of Vera's reliability. Epictetus helps identify an added judgment; the research procedure reminds us that accuracy needs identifiable grounds. Neither source makes a friend an infallible instrument for determining another person's character. Their comparison clarifies a question rather than providing a universal answer.

III. What a Label Adds to an Episode

A label often compresses a complex history into a stable name for someone. “Selfish,” “irresponsible,” or “unreliable” may express a general conclusion the speaker considers deserved. Examining it requires unpacking its concealed scope. Does it concern one agreement, some shared tasks, or every domain of life? Does it imply recurrence, permanence, or a cause? Without these distinctions, the dispute readily becomes irresolvable: Vera remembers fulfilled promises, Dmitri remembers this delay, and each considers their example sufficient. One good case does not cancel a bad one; one bad case does not invalidate every good one. A generalization requires identifying which cases really bear on the same question and how they were selected.

Dmitri may have other episodes that Vera overlooked. They deserve to be named without treating their number as proof of any possible scope. Several delays under similar conditions might support a limited claim about that form of planning. They establish neither a motive automatically nor everything about someone's relationships. Vera may clarify circumstances that alter the explanation. Their relevance needs discussion: a new circumstance may explain a delay without cancelling the need to report it. Information can matter without excusing everything. The conversation need not choose between absolute blame and no error at all. An action can retain a negative assessment while the continuation of that assessment is limited. This is a distinction between claims, not a bargain over who wins.

In instruction 44, Epictetus separates wealth or eloquence from being better as a whole person. The relevant form of inference is that a particular property establishes no complete human worth. This historical distinction is no ready-made theory of modern labels. It helps prevent a confirmed delay from becoming the final answer about Vera. The action still requires discussion. Limiting a broad conclusion makes neither its consequences insignificant nor Dmitri's work unmentionable. It permits a request for a relevant correction: warn about delays, agree on another time, or decline a promise that cannot be fulfilled. Such questions concern conduct available for discussion rather than an unchanging human essence. They can be serious without claiming to determine the person completely.

IV. What a Friend Specifically Contributes

A friend may know shared tasks, customary communication, life circumstances, and earlier agreements. This can make an observation more substantial than a passing impression. Dmitri knows why the diagram was needed in the morning and how Vera previously helped with walks. His access is still bounded. He may not know about an unexpected change in her day or may remember primarily irritating episodes. Closeness offers possible information, not exemption from checking. “You have known me for years” cannot replace “What exactly did you observe?” Nor can Vera refute a comment merely by referring to her personal history when the particular deadline and consequences have already been established. Familiarity matters through relevant information, not through its duration alone.

Vazire's 2010 study proposes distinguishing traits' observability and evaluativeness. Self-ratings and ratings by friends and unfamiliar participants related differently to chosen criteria across groups of properties. This does not mean friends are invariably more accurate than the person or strangers. American undergraduates participated; the author discusses limits of traits, criteria, methods, and cultural applicability. For Vera's conversation, specifying the subject matters. Someone might see shared tasks' completion clearly while knowing little about an inward experience. Another might hear an explanation of intentions without seeing promises fulfilled. Different forms of access should not be combined into the title of best expert on an entire personality. What one observer can contribute depends partly on the particular question asked.

The observation's content needs to match the observer's access. Dmitri's participation is relevant if he discusses preparing shared walks. Extending the conclusion to Vera's work, which he has not seen, would require other grounds. Accepting the first claim means no acceptance of the second. This is not arbitrary selection of pleasant information: subject, not convenience, determines the boundary. Vera may dislike an accurate, limited assessment. Dmitri may be right about one issue and imprecise about another. A friend's comment remains useful when it permits that difference instead of requiring acceptance of everything as a sign of trust. Their relationship matters without supplying missing information about every sphere of their lives. A valuable contribution can remain partial.

V. Unpleasant Words and Care

Proverbs contrasts open rebuke with secret love, and a friend's wounds with an enemy's kisses. The first clause of verse 6 in the historical English KJV reads, “Faithful are the wounds of a friend.” This is religious wisdom concerning fidelity and outward pleasantness, not an empirical test of any comment. It allows care to mean more than what feels pleasant to hear. The opposite inference is also excessive: that hurting words must be true. Pain is the recipient's experience; it establishes no grounds for the claim. A friend's comment can be accurate and unpleasant, mistaken and unpleasant, useful in one part and excessive in another. These differences remain open to examination rather than being settled by the feeling alone.

Dmitri may speak sharply because preparation failed, while Vera may experience his words as threatening the entire friendship. These possibilities establish neither participant's hidden intention. Their experience can be acknowledged before separating the form of speech from the deadline. Apologizing for a general verdict does not cancel discussion of the delay. Acknowledging the delay makes no form of address automatically acceptable. Two connected subjects are involved: reporting an action and delivering that report to someone. When one conceals the other, people either demand endurance of everything for truth's sake or reject all information because the tone hurts. Neither helps distinguish what requires a response and what the speaker should revise. A careful discussion can preserve both questions.

The selected verses also mention satiety and hunger, heartfelt counsel, and a nearby neighbor. This context retains varied practical distinctions rather than a formula that all injury is useful. In our conversation, we can ask whether the comment concerns the action under discussion and whether its content can be clarified. This is an author application, no list of signs of a true friend supposedly extracted from the text. Care is not measured by a remark's sting and requires no agreement with every word. Readers can accept particular testimony, postpone discussing its form, or end a conversation they do not wish to continue. Unpleasantness alone determines no correct choice and does not cancel an established consequence of their own conduct.

VI. Friendship as Shared Activity

In Book IX of the Nicomachean Ethics, Aristotle asks whether a flourishing person needs friends. Selected Chapter IX.9 distinguishes kinds of friendship and discusses activity that may be easier to sustain with another person. Living together includes discussion and thought, not simply physical proximity. The argument concerns virtuous friendship within Aristotle's account of the good, not every present-day acquaintance. For our subject, it suggests placing a comment within shared activity. Dmitri and Vera do more than assess each other from outside. They attempt a walk for which one person's actions change the other's possibilities. A particular deadline can therefore matter within friendship without turning friendship into surveillance. Shared participation gives the observation a context that a general character label may obscure.

When discussion concerns their shared task, the question changes: what happened between our actions, and what needs clarification before the next preparation? Dmitri can describe his work on the sheet; Vera can describe preparing the diagram and when she realized it would be late. This enlarges the picture without requiring a complete private biography. Information should be selected by relevance to the task. Wanting to be understood grants no right to demand disclosure of everything; wanting privacy erases no promise to report a delay, if such a promise was made. Participants may acknowledge some facts while understanding the causes differently. Different perspectives need not make shared activity impossible, although another agreement may be necessary. Clarification can identify that need without guaranteeing the agreement will follow.

Aristotle's friendship ideal establishes no obligation to continue every discussion or shared task. Vera and Dmitri may prepare separately, change the deadline, check readiness beforehand, or stop undertaking this task together. These are choices in the example, not source-established recommendations. Their quality depends on the participants' actual possibilities and wishes. Friendship does not become insincere because a particular shared role does not suit both people. If a comment allows its subject to be discussed and leaves room for choice, it may assist shared activity. If accepting a final character verdict is demanded before discussing the task, useful information acquires an excessive condition. A particular observation then becomes a means of defining another person completely. Its informational value and that demand should remain distinguishable.

VII. Making a Comment's Subject Available

An observation becomes clearer when the speaker identifies an episode, action, and related expectation. Dmitri can say that the promised diagram arrived in the evening, preventing preparation in the morning. Time, action, and consequence are specified. He may add that he wants warning when a deadline changes. This is a request about future arrangements, not an established conclusion about a past motive. It deserves a separate answer: Vera can agree, propose another arrangement, or acknowledge that she cannot promise that deadline. Distinguishing report from request helps avoid presenting one as the other. Otherwise, an observation becomes a concealed order the recipient must obey to be recognized as a good person. A request can be explicit without pretending to be a finding.

The observer's certainty also has a boundary. If Dmitri does not know when Vera recognized the delay, he can ask instead of asserting that she deliberately failed to warn him. A question need not be pleasant, but remains a question. If correspondence confirms the deadline, he can refer to the relevant passage without publishing private messages. Discussion requires neither a secret dossier nor general approval from others. A count of supporters replaces no grounds for a particular comment. Several friends may know one incident through Dmitri's story; this is not several independent observations of Vera. The information's origin changes the scope of the possible conclusion even when everyone speaks sincerely. Agreement and independent access are different matters.

Epictetus's action-assessment distinction helps limit a report; Vazire's research framing helps specify accuracy's subject. Neither source prescribes one correct formula for friendly criticism. Identical words may work differently depending on circumstances and the relationship's history. In our story, accessible grounds matter more than an ideally polite construction. The recipient needs to understand which claim they are asked to accept and what can be clarified. The speaker needs room to retain a negative assessment of an action without expanding it to an entire personality for emphasis. The dispute then gains a subject both can discuss. Its outcome may be agreement, limited correction, or an acknowledged disagreement rather than obligatory reconciliation. Clarity improves the definition of the problem without deciding every response to it.

VIII. Hearing an Observation Without Accepting Everything

Vera can start by repeating what she acknowledges: she sent the diagram in the evening. This accepts no entirety of Dmitri's conclusions. She can clarify the consequence and which promise he regards as broken. An actual agreement need not be denied because a global label accompanied the complaint. Facts conflicting with her memory should be identified separately. This is no established method for calming conflict. It simply separates claims needing different grounds. A participant can think, pause, or decline to continue now. Immediate agreement measures no sincerity; refusing every clarification does not establish one's own account either. Taking time and taking responsibility are not automatically opposites, although neither alone settles the disputed facts.

It helps to distinguish objecting to content from objecting to scope. Vera may accept that the delay complicated preparation while disputing “unreliable in general.” She may not fully know the delay's cause while remembering a particular circumstance. She can report it without demanding to be declared blameless. Separately, she can say that a general verdict hurts and obstructs discussion of the task. Her feeling matters for their relationship without cancelling the time of delivery. Dmitri's feeling likewise proves no motive in Vera. Retaining both experiences and both conclusions' boundaries is harder than appointing one final judge. It leaves room for relevant information, including information that changes only part of the assessment rather than vindicating one person completely.

If the subject cannot be clarified, Vera can stop the exchange and return later to the specific agreement. This is neither a general rule for avoiding criticism nor a promise that pausing improves relationships. Sometimes discussion never resumes. Responsibility for the action remains: she can report the deadline, supply the promised material, or decline another promise separately. Rejecting a label grants no automatic exemption from consequences. Equally, familiarity makes no assessment obligatory to accept whole. A specific conversation depends on being able to distinguish, confirm, dispute, and leave open. Without those possibilities, more explanations do not necessarily make the exchange more substantial or accurate for either participant. The volume of discussion is not the same as its relevance to the question.

IX. Correcting an Action and Correcting a Comment

In our example, Vera can acknowledge promising noon and failing to warn about the delay, while Dmitri can acknowledge that his general conclusion exceeded his grounds. These are two corrections that can happen together or separately. One concerns conduct, the other a judgment about someone. There is no need to await the second before acknowledging the first, or abandon the first to request precision in the second. This symmetry implies no equality of actions or harm. Each subject has its own consequences and grounds. Comparing them allows separate examination rather than a bargain in which acknowledging one error purchases an obligatory acknowledgment of another. The possibility of two corrections should not conceal that each must be assessed on its own basis.

The next agreement also needs specificity. Instead of “I will always be reliable now,” Vera could promise to report readiness the previous day or decline a deadline that does not suit her. Dmitri could explain how much printing time he needs rather than expect a friend to infer every detail. These are possible choices in an invented task, without studied efficacy. A more modest promise may be a useful correction. It creates no flawless self-image but lets someone plan under understandable conditions. If Vera cannot ensure readiness, declining the task honestly gives Dmitri another decision to make. Closeness requires neither taking every shared task nor treating every boundary as rejecting friendship. A limited commitment can be meaningful without covering everything.

Later, the new arrangement can be assessed in relation to its conditions. A fulfilled agreement does not erase the previous delay but adds another episode. A repeated error needs its own discussion. Changed observations can alter a general conclusion; one successful case need not immediately restore an ideal image. Relevant actions and the selection of examples matter. Remembering only what confirms irritation closes a generalization to correction. Remembering only good actions loses particular consequences. Friends can retain an error's history and the possibility of different conduct without requiring either forgetting everything or treating the past as final proof of an unchanging future. Such a conclusion remains bounded and open to checking. It leaves room for evidence about what actually happens next.

X. Precision Retains Seriousness and Freedom

A friend's observation differs from a label through accessible subject and grounds, not through the absence of unpleasant words. It identifies what happened, how this is known, and which conclusion is proposed. An assessment can be strict and negative when its standard fits the situation. A label becomes excessive when one episode is presented as a final description allowing no clarification of boundaries. Vera benefits from knowing about the delay and consequences; Dmitri benefits from knowing exactly which part she accepts or disputes. Neither needs complete knowledge of the other's inward life to discuss actions. Such discussion gives neither the right to declare that inward life completely known. Serious criticism and limited knowledge can coexist without making criticism empty.

The sources offer different grounds. Epictetus distinguishes action from judgment and a particular advantage from a whole human image. Vazire considers perspectives' accuracy for specified traits and criteria with sample and method limitations. Aristotle discusses virtuous friendship through shared activity and thought. Proverbs shows that fidelity does not equal outward pleasantness, retaining its religious genre. These cannot be combined into a rule that every friend is always right or every painful conversation beneficial. Comparing them helps ask what information a comment contains and what relationship its delivery creates. Their differences leave the question available to the particular task instead of promising one instruction for every closeness and criticism. Similar concerns do not erase different methods or assumptions.

Our example could result in an acknowledged delay, a limited general conclusion, and an understandable choice about the next agreement. This neither reforms an entire personality nor guarantees good friendship. It gives more precise knowledge about a shared episode. Someone can hear an unwelcome observation while retaining the right to clarify its grounds. They can reject a label while retaining responsibility for conduct. They can discuss consequences without demanding access to every motive. The comment remains serious, and its recipient remains a participant rather than an object of final definition. Friendship may support this conversation without replacing its content or exempting either person from distinguishing what is known from what inference adds. A close relationship can make that distinction matter more, not less.

What this means in practice

1. Choose a comment about your conduct that can be considered without disclosing private information about others. Separate the episode's description, its consequence, a proposed cause, and a general conclusion about the person. Do not supply a part that the speaker did not state. Mark what you know, dispute, or cannot yet check. This examines a claim rather than rating the entire friendship.

2. If both of you freely want to discuss the comment, ask one question about its grounds: which moment or agreement is meant? Clarify whether the present task is feedback, discussing consequences, or deciding the next arrangement. Allow either participant not to continue. Declining confirms or refutes no content; without further discussion, retain the limits of available information.

3. Choose one specific correction or identify a disagreement. It might clarify a deadline, acknowledge a consequence, replace an excessively broad word, or decline an unsuitable promise. Specify the situation concerned. This voluntary, author-created exercise has no studied efficacy and promises no reconciliation. It requires no secret recording, public adjudication, diagnosis, or acceptance of every general conclusion about you.

Key quotation

> *“Faithful are the wounds of a friend”*

Proverbs 27:6, the verse's first clause, in the historical English King James Version. The Russian rendering is the author's translation through KJV, without Hebrew collation. Religious wisdom contrasts fidelity and outward pleasantness; it establishes neither every wound nor every friend's comment as faithful.

Connections between traditions

1. **Action description — assessment criterion.** Epictetus 45, quick bathing and assessment; Vazire (2010), Participants/Procedure and Limitations. Identify an action and grounds for the ensuing conclusion. A Stoic instruction differs from a research criterion; neither makes a friend an infallible instrument.

2. **Shared participation — access boundary.** Aristotle IX.9, activity and shared thought; Vazire (2010), abstract and limitations. Closeness may provide context, but different subjects need different access. Aristotelian virtuous friendship is not every acquaintance; the study ranks no experts on an entire personality.

3. **Fidelity in discomfort — shared good activity.** Proverbs 27:5–6; Aristotle IX.9. Care does not reduce to pleasure in words, and a comment can be examined within a shared task. Neither religious instruction nor ethical ideal proves every painful criticism true.

4. **Property — whole person.** Epictetus 44; Vazire (2010), trait differences in the abstract. An established assessment retains its sphere and conditions rather than determining entire human worth. This removes no responsibility for an action and transfers no group result to an individual character.

5. **Pleasantness — judgment's grounds.** Proverbs 27:5–7; Epictetus 45. Words' emotional effect and truth require different questions. Pain tests no truth, pleasantness tests no falsehood; the recipient's experience remains significant.

6. **Shared discussion — method's limits.** Aristotle IX.9, living together; Vazire (2010), Limitations. A conversation can refine both accounts while preserving limits of knowledge. It is voluntary, requires no full biography, and has no established efficacy as an author exercise.

Primary sources

1. Epictetus. Enchiridion 44–45. Historical English translation by Elizabeth Carter. Both instructions were read in full by this author for preceding topic I10 and are reused within those bounds. A Stoic distinction between description, assessment, and human worth, not a clinical test. The Russian epigraph is an original rendering through Carter; no Greek collation.

2. Simine Vazire. Who Knows What About a Person? The Self–Other Knowledge Asymmetry (SOKA) Model. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 98(2), 2010, 281–300, original English on the author's website. Actual complete abstract, Participants/Procedure, and Limitations reading for I10 is reused. Full Results/Measures were not read. Specific criteria and the American undergraduate sample limit application to every friend or a whole personality.

3. Aristotle. Nicomachean Ethics IX.9. W. D. Ross's English translation in the Internet Classics Archive. This author read the entire selected chapter for I-02-N01; neither the complete work nor Greek collation is claimed. The argument concerns virtuous friendship and Aristotle's account of the good, not every modern relationship or a measured benefit of criticism.

4. Proverbs 27:5–10, King James Version. All six selected verses were read before writing. Historical English KJV; the Russian key fragment is an original translation through it, without Hebrew collation. Religious instructions about fidelity, counsel, and nearness establish neither every comment's truth nor every inflicted injury's benefit.

Tags

#Friendship, #Observation, #Labels, #Feedback, #Criticism, #Care, #Fidelity, #Description, #Assessment, #Grounds, #Context, #Episode, #Agreement, #Promise, #Consequence, #Responsibility, #Intention, #Character, #Boundaries, #Conversation, #VoluntaryParticipation, #Disagreement, #Correction, #Reliability, #Epictetus, #Aristotle, #Vazire, #Proverbs, #SelfKnowledge, #UnitedWisdom

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.