

UNITED WISDOM

“I Feel Bad”: Clarifying Without Demanding Immediate Certainty

The Person and Inner Life

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

I-06-N03 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

“I Feel Bad”: Clarifying Without Demanding Immediate Certainty

Epigraph

> *“I am so troubled that I cannot speak”.*

Psalm 77:4, the final part in the King James Version. The chapter read and its numbering.

What this article is about

“I feel bad” can be the first available message when precise words are missing. It may concern experience, physical wellbeing, circumstances, or several aspects together. Clarification helps when it serves understanding and the present task. Demanding immediate certainty can turn conversation into an examination someone never chose. This article moves from available description toward voluntary clarification: what happened, which quality is noticeable, when it appeared, what remains unknown, and what someone wants from conversation. We infer no diagnosis from a general phrase and prescribe no treatment through a feeling's name. Historical lament and research on emotion labeling retain their limits. The practical purpose is making the next conversation or choice somewhat more definite while preserving the right to approximate speech, correct words, leave one's entire history unexplained, and stop when further clarification does not help now.

I. A general message already matters

“I feel bad” conveys that someone assesses present experience as difficult or unwanted. It is not yet a precise feeling label, proof of cause, or account of every circumstance. It is nevertheless meaningful. It may suffice to begin conversation, state a limit, or request participation. When a listener immediately demands a detailed internal report, the initial message loses its purpose: contact is replaced by a prerequisite for being heard.

Imagine someone returning home after a meeting and telling a close person, “I feel bad.” They do not know whether the heaviness concerns a remark, fatigue, or anticipation of another discussion. What is available can be acknowledged: “I understand that things are difficult now.” A preferred format can then be asked about if they are ready. An unconfirmed cause need not be endorsed: “They devalued you again.” Experience need not be rejected either: “Nothing happened.” Both statements say more than the initial message establishes.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

The general phrase retains its status. Someone reports experience rather than presenting a scientific measurement. Words can be clarified later without declaring the first message a lie. “I now understand that I was more anxious” changes description without canceling initial difficulty. Even when no precise name emerges, the message can support a particular question: can they continue a meeting, do they need another deadline, do they want to talk or remain without conversation now?

Brevity should not be read as character. Few words prove neither closedness, immaturity, hidden resistance, nor a particular personality type. Perhaps that is all available now, perhaps brevity is chosen, perhaps details are irrelevant to the task. Further understanding requires their words and conditions. Clarification should add definition to the situation rather than extract a biographical explanation merely because the initial sentence was general.

II. Establish the conversation's purpose first

Before searching for an emotion's name, it helps to understand why someone speaks. They may want attention, communicate an inability to participate, discuss an event, clarify a condition, or request specific action. These tasks differ. A request to postpone a meeting may not need lengthy vocabulary work. A wish to tell a story may be interrupted by an immediate solution. Conversation's purpose is better asked about or agreed than assumed from one message about a difficult state.

In the hypothetical home scene, a question might be “Would you like to tell me, discuss a next step, or not talk now?” It should not become a rigid menu. Someone can answer otherwise: “I do not know; just sit beside me,” or “I need to understand what happened.” If conversation is chosen, its proportion can be clarified: a few minutes, one scene, one request. A correctly chosen format cannot promise reduced feeling. It defines shared participation's conditions rather than a guaranteed emotional outcome.

The listener also has available resources. They may be able to listen briefly now or return later. Such a boundary proves no indifference, just as a request creates no duty to listen endlessly. An actual offer differs from an impossible promise. “Let us talk for twenty minutes this evening” becomes an agreement only with both people's consent. Before then, it is an option. Unagreed time cannot be counted as support already secured.

Purpose can change during discussion. Beginning with a wish to tell something, someone may then want a deadline clarified or conversation ended. The format can be updated when participants are willing. This does not mean discussion began wrongly. It supplied information. A good frame remains voluntary and revisable rather than requiring every “I feel bad” to proceed through cause, emotion label, practical action, and final relief as its only permissible sequence.

III. Experience and physical wellbeing need distinguishing

Everyday “bad” can mean emotional difficulty, physical wellbeing, or uncomfortable conditions. The word alone cannot select an area. For this topic, asking what someone means helps without determining their bodily state for them. When the concern is physical wellbeing, emotional vocabulary does not replace examining that question. The article considers conversation and description; it establishes no medical cause, offers no treatment plan, and does not turn every bodily account into a hidden emotion.

Imagine someone saying “I feel bad” after a long meeting, meaning a stuffy room and wanting to leave. The listener asks about shame and fear, although the available task concerns room conditions. In another scene, “bad” concerns disappointment after an unsuccessful agreement. The same opening does not make the scenes identical. “Is this about physical wellbeing, experience, or something else?” can help select an area when “I cannot separate them yet” remains possible.

A bodily quality can be described without a causal account: “heaviness,” “tension,” “wanting to step away.” Such words prove no particular emotion or origin. Sensations should not be reconstructed through a table: anxiety must have one body, anger another. What was actually reported can remain while action is considered separately. Choosing to leave a room establishes that action. How the situation changed and what remains unknown can only be learned afterward.

Distinguishing areas requires no immediate complete certainty. Sometimes the nearest participation question suffices: “Are you ready to stay in this conversation?” Sometimes details are not wanted. Only participation's conditions can then be discussed. Precision comes less from accumulating disclosures than from not converting what was reported into an unconfirmed explanation. The authors' format preserves someone's choice about how much body and experience to describe while retaining the present moment's circumstances.

IV. A quality can be described before a feeling is named

When an emotional name is missing, qualities remain available: heavy, unpleasant, empty, tense, aching, difficult to concentrate. These expressions need not match professional vocabulary. They communicate distinctions already noticed. Asking what a word means to this person in this scene matters. “Empty” may mean different things to different people. The term establishes no cause, particular need, or lasting trait. Its meaning becomes clearer through personal description and circumstances.

In a hypothetical conversation, “I feel bad” becomes “Something feels heavy, and I want distance.” Distance from what can be clarified: conversation, a decision, people, or noise. An

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

unknown answer remains unknown. The experience need not immediately be called sadness or fear. A suitable description might be “I feel heavy after the discussion; cannot be more precise yet; do not want to continue now.” It communicates timing, quality, and participation without an invented internal theory.

In Job 10:1–3, bitterness of soul develops into complaint and a question addressed to God. This is religious writing about suffering and address, rather than a contemporary classifier of states. Its limited relevance here is speech beginning with experience's quality and a question while retaining its purpose. The passage provides no diagnosis of Job or the reader and no promised result of ordinary conversation from a religious scene.

A quality description can be final for the present stage. When it sufficiently supports a pause, question, or format, searching for a noun is optional. A word may appear later from another scene or clarification. It is not automatically more authentic because it sounds precise. Useful clarification preserves what someone wanted to communicate and reduces misunderstanding. It does not replace earlier experience with the correct category a listener would prefer.

V. Names can be offered as possibilities

Several words sometimes help someone find their own. A suggestion remains useful when it stays a possibility: “More like sadness, irritation, anxiety, or something else?” It should not announce the correct label in advance. All options can be rejected, several chosen, wording changed, or the question postponed. Interpreting disagreement as hidden resistance removes freedom from the offer. Clarifying a name gives a listener no access to internal experience more reliable than the person's voluntary account.

In the hypothetical scene, someone close suggests “hurt.” The speaker replies, “No, I am more concerned that the deadline will now be missed.” This matters. It directs discussion toward information about timing and participation. The first hypothesis need not be defended with “You have not understood your hurt yet.” Which deadline is concerning and what is known can be asked. A new label helps pose a question but does not establish a missed deadline or anyone's refusal to fulfill an obligation.

In Lieberman and colleagues' 2007 study, labeling images' emotional content was compared with other processing conditions using functional MRI. The publisher abstract is available here; it does not state sample size. Its finding does not promise that choosing a word in personal conversation necessarily brings relief. A laboratory operation and our voluntary discussion differ. Scientific support limits a hasty promise rather than turning vocabulary into a compulsory exercise for everyone.

A word's usefulness can therefore be considered against the task: is the topic clearer; has a revisable request emerged; was anything important lost? Anxiety can be named and remain. A

date can be clarified without finding a label. An absence of relief does not prove a word incorrect; relief does not prove a causal explanation. These outcomes need distinguishing. Vocabulary supports communication when it remains a descriptive and choice-making resource rather than a promise automatically to change experience.

VI. A nearby scene helps more than a ready biography

Clarification often needs only one episode: when something became noticeable, which remark remained, what happened afterward. This promises no final cause. It supplies nearby information to work with. “You always fear rejection” requires grounds of its own and does not become true through one “I feel bad.” Someone may want to examine the past, but a listener should not invent their biography to finish an incomplete present account.

Imagine someone remembering when a task was transferred to another person during a meeting. Whether this concerned work quality, availability, or a new condition is unknown. “What exactly was announced?” remains open. “Did you feel unwanted, as in childhood?” immediately offers someone else's history. Even if possible, that history is unestablished. The first useful distinction may concern a decision and its grounds rather than an internal repetition nobody has described.

When someone recalls a similar earlier scene themselves, comparison can be specific: what resembles, what differs, which information is available? One similar feeling does not establish a lasting pattern. Perhaps announcements recur in the same form, information is repeatedly missing, or only a familiar word recurs. Different events should not be combined too quickly. History supports inquiry when separate episodes and revisable links remain rather than explaining every future case through one universal psychological story.

A scene has memory limits too. Exact words may be forgotten, order approximate, a message unsaved. These qualifications make description more usable rather than morally weaker. Clarification matters when information can be obtained and affects choice. If reconstruction is impossible, present conditions can be examined: deadline, role, willingness to participate. Speaking about experience does not require presenting a perfect archive of everything that happened.

VII. Silence can remain the boundary of present speech

Sometimes someone declines or cannot continue in words. Silence reveals no automatic cause. It may mean a choice, insufficient time, missing words, or a need for another format. It should not be treated as final rejection of a relationship or confirmation of a listener's hidden theory. The present message's limit can be acknowledged and practical conditions agreed separately. Conversation need not access all internal experience before participants can stop.

In Psalm 77:1–6 according to KJV numbering, difficulty speaking belongs within address to God, memory, and searching. The religious context remains; Russian Synodal numbering differs. The text is not a psychological guide to silence and establishes no identical mechanism for everyone. The limited resemblance concerns language acknowledging inability to express difficulty immediately. It justifies neither demanding silence nor promising silence itself will provide an answer.

In an ordinary hypothetical scene, someone can say, “I cannot clarify now; I will return to this later if I choose.” A work obligation to respond remains a separate deadline question. Personal explanation can differ from a necessary decision: someone's whole experience can remain unexamined while availability for a task is communicated. These rights and obligations depend on conditions. An emotional phrase cannot establish them, just as promising to return cannot count as an already completed conversation.

A listener can leave a brief unpressured offer: “I heard you; tell me if you decide to continue.” It guarantees no permanent availability and should not imply a limitless promise. Later time, if needed, requires separate agreement. Stopping sometimes preserves contact and sometimes leaves a question unresolved. Both outcomes can be described honestly. The present stage can simply retain what was communicated and what remains open without an invented explanation of quiet.

VIII. Clarification should not become interrogation

Many consecutive questions can burden conversation even when each seems useful. The next question should follow the current task and response. Timing, object, quality, action, memory, need, and history are not a compulsory uninterrupted checklist. Once a date needs clarification, discussion can move there. When someone wants only to tell something, analyzing every possible cause may be another person's task imposed upon their initial message.

Imagine ten questions following “I feel bad”: what do you feel, where in the body, what does it remind you of, what do you want, whom do you blame? The speaker begins answering options without choosing such reflection. Answer count then guarantees no precision. A smaller frame helps: “One question: what matters to understand now?” Sometimes hearing one scene suffices; sometimes another conversation is preferred. Clarification's usefulness depends on preserved meaning and consent rather than filled internal boxes.

A question already containing a verdict needs particular care. “Why are you dramatizing everything again?” offers a character assessment. “What was difficult in this scene?” allows a specific answer and unknowns. A gentle tone does not make the first sentence open. Content

also affects freedom. Someone must be able to reject the premise without rejection automatically confirming what the listener supposedly knows about them better.

An unhelpful question can be changed or inquiry stopped. Pressure need not double for the initial method's sake. “That question did not fit; shall we describe the event?” remains an offer when refusal is possible. Clarification becomes shared work through actual participation rather than caring vocabulary alone. This article's format should make conversation more definite while retaining human proportion, rather than turning every difficulty into an obligatory procedure.

IX. A next step can be clearer than a cause

A final cause can remain unknown while a small action is chosen. Clarifying a deadline, postponing discussion, requesting written conditions, or stating willingness to participate are different possible steps. Their suitability depends on circumstances and purpose. We offer no universal solution to “I feel bad.” We distinguish practical inquiry from a demand first to explain experience completely. Sometimes choice requires a cause; sometimes present information suffices for limited action that supplies further information.

In the hypothetical work scene, someone does not yet understand their state but knows a task was transferred without a clear explanation. A possible question is “What changed in allocation, and does my part remain?” It examines a circumstance without supplying another person's motive. The answer can update description. A new time constraint is information; no answer is an absence of information. Neither automatically proves why someone initially felt bad.

A step need not be large. A prepared phrase may remain unsent; a decision may need someone else's agreement; an agreed conversation may not occur yet. These stages must differ so internal clarity is not counted as changed external conditions. When the purpose was finding words, a description can complete the present stage. When it was agreement, an actual response and consent are needed. Purpose sets the outcome criterion rather than an emotional name itself.

Changed feeling after action remains separate too. A clear answer can arrive while upset remains; relief can occur without an answer. Neither erases the other. What became known, was completed, remains unknown, and is wanted next should remain visible. This preserves freedom to continue or stop without requiring every conversation about difficulty to end in relief, a precise cause, and a completely resolved life scene.

X. Sufficient clarity preserves the right to correct

A sufficiently clear description serves the current task. It need not exhaust experience or be final. “I feel heavy after the meeting and want to understand allocation” may suffice for a work question. “I feel bad and am not ready to explain now” may suffice for a conversational boundary. Another word can update description later. The right to self-correction matters from the start without requiring admission that an earlier phrase was badly constructed or immature.

Imagine someone initially calling their state anxiety, then realizing after clarification that anger about an unagreed decision predominates. The history can remain: first the deadline was unknown, then the decision procedure emerged. This need not choose between a true and false feeling. Information and available description changed. Assessing conduct still requires facts about agreement; choosing action requires purpose and conditions. A new word gains no automatic authority to explain someone's whole past or a relationship's future.

Historical supports and research serve different roles. Job speaks in religious complaint, the psalm addresses God amid difficulty speaking, laboratory research examines labeling images. They do not form one proven clarification protocol. The authors' conclusion concerns conversation's proportion: begin with an available message, agree its purpose, offer one useful question, retain unknowns. Comparison supports respect for different speech without establishing religious grounds' scientific truth or a particular emotional vocabulary's obligatory use.

A suitable ending can be simple: “I now know which question I want to ask; the rest remains unclear.” Or “This is enough now; I am stopping.” These differ and can both be named without promises. Clarification serves someone when available definition increases while authorship of their account remains theirs. It loses purpose when requiring an attractive ending at any cost. Unknowns can remain part of precision, stopping a deliberate proportion of present participation.

What this means in practice

Begin with the available phrase, even if only “I feel bad.” Clarify what you want now: to tell something, state a limit, examine one circumstance, or request action. When words are missing, quality and timing can be described. Every possible question need not be answered. Select one that actually affects understanding, and allow “I do not know yet.” This is an authors' conversation format without diagnosis or promised relief.

For the hypothetical meeting: “I feel heavy after the task transfer; cannot be more precise yet. It is unclear whether my part remains. I want to ask about allocation.” Experience, an unknown, and a possible step are preserved. Before asking, external conditions cannot count as clarified.

After an answer, add actual information. A changed emotion label is a separate correction. If no label appears, a useful task answer can still remain an outcome.

Offer another person room to correct your formulation: “Have I understood that difficulty arose specifically after the meeting?” A different answer should update the affected part. The first version need not be defended as deeper. The next question's suitability can also be asked about. This is no formal consent ceremony before every word; it keeps participation actual and reveals when conversation stops serving its chosen purpose or available resources.

When clarity does not increase, the same approach need not continue. Stop, choose another moment, or retain only a practical condition: conversation ends now, a deadline response will come separately. Stopping confirms no cause and erases no experience. It communicates the present stage's limit. Later, a record can be revisited, changed, or left alone while responsibility for specifically accepted agreements remains alongside freedom not to explain all internal content immediately.

Key quotation

> *“I will speak in the bitterness of my soul”.*

Job 10:1, the final part in the King James Version. Context, 10:1–3. The complaint subsequently addresses God; its religious meaning remains.

Connections between traditions

Comparison	Similarity	Limit
Job ↔ describing quality	Bitterness receives speech and a question.	Religious complaint is neither classification nor treatment.
Psalm ↔ words' limit	Difficulty speaking can be named directly.	Address to God is not reduced to psychological instruction.
Lieberman ↔ a proposed name	Labeling is a distinct research operation.	Images do not guarantee relief in a personal scene.
Job ↔ psalm	Difficult experience receives a place in address.	Different texts form no single causal emotion model.
Sources ↔ authors' practice	Language can be examined through its purpose.	Similarity does not make conversation a scientifically proven protocol.

Primary sources and research

• Psalm 77, especially 1–6, King James Version. Difficulty speaking in religious context; numbering of the edition read retained.

• Job 10:1–3, King James Version. Bitterness, complaint, and a question to God.

• Lieberman, M. D., and colleagues. *Putting Feelings Into Words*. Psychological Science 18, 421–428, 2007. Publisher abstract on labeling images during fMRI read; neither full-text access nor known sample size claimed.

Tags

feeling bad, clarification, clarity, experience's quality, feeling, vocabulary, question, time, scene, unknowns, conversation, attention, participation, boundary, consent, pause, physical wellbeing, description, cause, hypothesis, action, agreement, outcome, correction, Job, psalm, Lieberman, emotion labeling, voluntary participation, proportion

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.